

THE AMERICAN I M A G O

VOL .15

FALL
1958

NO. 3

*A Psychoanalytic Journal
for the Arts and Sciences*

COPYRIGHT BY
AMERICAN IMAGO 1958

Founded by: Hanns Sachs, Boston
Publisher and Managing Editor: George B. Wilbur, M. D.

PRINTED AT THE REGISTER PRESS
YARMOUTH PORT, MASSACHUSETTS

The Next Assignment*

by

William L. Langer

Anyone who, like myself, has the honor to serve as president of this association and to address it on the occasion of its annual meeting may be presumed to have devoted many years to the historical profession, to have taught many successive college generations, to have trained numerous young scholars, and to have written at least some books and articles. The chances are equally great that he has reached those exalted levels of the academic life which involve so many administrative and advisory duties, as well as such expenditure of time and energy in seeing people, in writing recommendations, and in reading the writings of others that he is most unlikely ever again to have much time to pursue his own researches. Nonetheless, his long and varied experience and his ever broadening contacts with scholars working in many diverse fields have probably sharpened his understanding of the problems of his own profession and enhanced his awareness of the many lacunae in our knowledge of the

*Presidential address delivered at the annual dinner of the American Historical Association, the Statler Hotel, New York City, December 29, 1957 and reprinted, with permission and with minor stylistic changes, from the *American Historical Review*, Vol. LXIII, No. 2, January, 1958. I have benefited greatly from long discussion of this problem with my brother, Dr. Walter C. Langer. I have also to thank Professors Talcott Parsons and Raymond A. Bauer, for stimulating comments on an early draft of the address, and Professors James C. Diggory and A. Pepitone, of the University of Pennsylvania, for allowing me to read their unpublished report on "Behavior and Disaster."

world and of mankind, both in the past and in the present. It would seem altogether fitting, therefore, that I, for one, should make use of this occasion not so much for reflection on the past achievements of the profession (which is what might be expected of a historian), as for speculation about its needs and its future—that is, about the directions which historical study might profitably take in the years to come.

I am sure to sense, at this juncture, a certain uneasiness in my audience, for historians, having dedicated their lives to the exploration and understanding of the past, are apt to be suspicious of novelty and ill-disposed toward crystal-gazing. In the words of my distinguished predecessor, they lack the “speculative audacity” of the natural scientists, those artisans of brave hypotheses. The tendency of many historians to become buried in their own conservatism strikes me as truly regrettable. What basically may be a virtue tends to become a vice, locking our intellectual faculties in the molds of the past and preventing us from opening new horizons as our cousins in the natural sciences are constantly doing. If progress is to be made we must certainly have new ideas, new points of view, and new techniques. We must be ready, from time to time, to take flyers into the unknown, even though some of them may prove wide of the mark. Like the scientists, we can learn a lot from our own mistakes, and the chances are that, if we persist, each successive attempt may take us closer to the target. I should therefore like to ask myself this evening what direction is apt to lead to further progress in historical study; what direction, if I were a younger man, would claim my interest and attention; in short, what might be the historian’s “next assignment.”

We are all keenly aware of the fact that during the past half century the scope of historical study has been vastly extended. The traditional political-military history has become more comprehensive and more analytical and has been reinforced by researches into the social, economic, intellectual, scientific, and other aspects of the past, some of them truly remote from what used to be considered history. So far has this development gone that I find it difficult to envisage

much further horizontal expansion of the area of investigation.

There is, however, still ample scope for penetration in depth and I, personally, have no doubt that the "newest history" will be intensive rather than extensive. I refer more specifically to the urgently needed deepening of our historical understanding through the exploitation of the concepts and findings of modern psychology. And by this, may I add, I do not refer to classical or academic psychology which, so far as I can detect, has little bearing on historical problems, but rather to psychoanalysis and its later developments and variations as included in the terms "dynamic" or "depth psychology."

In the course of my reading over the years I have been much impressed by the prodigious impact of psychoanalytic doctrine on many, not to say most, fields of human study and expression. Of Freud himself it has been said that "he has in large part created the intellectual climate of our time."¹ "Almost alone," remarks a recent writer in the *Times Literary Supplement*, "he revealed the deepest sources of human endeavor and remorselessly pursued their implications for the individual and society."² Once the initial resistance to the recognition of unconscious, irrational forces in human nature was overcome, psychoanalysis quickly became a dominant influence in psychiatry, in abnormal psychology, and in personality study. The field of medicine is feeling its impact not only in the area of psychosomatic illness, but in the understanding of the doctor-patient relationship. Our whole educational system and the methods of child-training have been modified in the light of its findings. For anthropology it has opened new and wider vistas by providing for the first time "a theory of raw human nature" and by suggesting an explanation of otherwise incomprehensible cultural traits and practices. It has done much also to revise established notions about religion and has given a great impetus to pastoral care and social work. The problems of mythology and sociology have been illuminated by its insights, and more recently its influence has been strongly felt

in penology, in political science, and even in economics, while in the arts almost every major figure of the past generation has been in some measure affected by it.³

Despite this general and often profound intellectual and artistic reorientation since Freud published his first epoch-making works sixty years ago, historians have, as a group, maintained an almost completely negative attitude toward the teachings of psychoanalysis. Their lack of response has been due, I should think, less to constitutional obscurantism than to the fact that historians, as disciples of Thucydides, have habitually thought of themselves as psychologists in their own right. They have indulged freely in psychological interpretation, and have no doubt shared the fear that the humanistic appreciation of personality, as in poetry or drama, might be irretrievably lost through the application of a coldly penetrating calculus.⁴ Many have considered psychoanalytic doctrine too biological and too deterministic, as well as too conjectural, and they have, furthermore, been reluctant to recognize and deal with unconscious motives and irrational forces. Psychoanalysis, on the other hand, was a young science and therefore lacked the prestige to make historians acquire a guilt-complex about not being more fully initiated into its mysteries.⁵ Almost without exception, then, historians have stuck to the approach and methods of historicism, restricting themselves to recorded fact and to strictly rational motivation.⁶ So impervious has the profession as a whole been to the new teaching that an inquiry into the influence of psychoanalysis on modern thought, written a few years ago, made no mention whatever of history.⁷

This is as remarkable as it is lamentable, for, on the very face of it, psychoanalysis would seem to have much to contribute to the solution of historical problems. Many years of clinical work by hundreds of trained analysts have by now fortified and refined Freud's original theory of human drives, the conflicts to which they give rise, and the methods by which they are repressed or diverted. Psychoanalysis has long since ceased being merely a therapy and has been generally recognized as a theory basic to the study of the human per-

sonality. How can it be that the historian, who must be as much or more concerned with human beings and their motivation as with impersonal forces and causation, has failed to make use of these findings? Viewed in the light of modern depth psychology, the homespun, common-sense psychological interpretations of past historians, even some of the greatest, seem woefully inadequate, not to say naive⁸ Clearly the time has come for us to reckon with a doctrine that strikes so close to the heart of our own discipline.⁹

Since psychoanalysis is concerned primarily with the emotional life of the individual, its most immediate application is in the field of biography. Freud himself here showed the way, first in his essay on Leonardo da Vinci (1910) and later in his analytical study of Dostoevsky (1928). He was initially impressed by the similarity between some of the material produced by a patient in analysis and the only recorded childhood recollection of the great Italian artist. With this fragmentary memory as a starting point, Freud studied the writings and artistic productions of Leonardo and demonstrated how much light could be shed on his creative and scientific life through the methods of analysis. No doubt he erred with respect to certain points of art history. Quite possibly some of his deductions were unnecessarily involved or farfetched. Nonetheless, recent critics have testified that he was able, "thanks to his theory and method, and perhaps even more to his deep sympathy for the tragic and the problematic in Leonardo, to pose altogether new and important questions about his personality, questions which were unsuspected by earlier writers and to which no better answer than Freud's has yet been given."¹⁰

The striking novelty and the startling conclusions of Freud's essay on Leonardo had much to do with precipitating the flood of psychoanalytic or, better, pseudo-psychoanalytic biographical writing during the 1920's, almost all of which was of such a low order—ill-informed, sensational, scandalizing—that it brought the entire Freudian approach into disrepute. I have no doubt that this, in turn, discouraged serious scholars—the historians among them—from really

examining the possibilities of the new teachings. Only within the last generation has the situation begun to change. The basic concepts of psychoanalysis, such as the processes of repression, identification, projection, reaction formation, substitution, displacement, and sublimation, have by now become more firmly established through clinical work and have at the same time increasingly become part of our thinking. Meanwhile, concerted efforts have been made to build up systematic personality and character study on a psychoanalytic basis and the so-called neo-Freudians, advancing beyond the narrowly environmental factors, have done much to develop the significance of constitutional and cultural influences.¹¹

While recognized scholars in related fields, notably in political science, have begun to apply psychoanalytic principles to the study of personality types and their social role, historians have for the most part maintained an iron curtain between their own profession and that of the dynamic psychologists. It is, indeed, still professionally dangerous to admit any addiction to such unorthodox doctrine.¹² Even those who are in general intrigued by the potentialities of psychoanalysis are inclined to argue against its application to historical problems. They point out that detailed evidence on the crucial early years of an individual's life is rarely available and that, unlike the practicing analyst, the historian cannot turn to his subject and help him revive memories of specific events and relationships. To this it may be answered that the historian, on whatever basis he is operating, is always suffering from lack of data. Actually there is often considerable information about the family background of prominent historical personalities and the sum total of evidence about their careers is in some cases enormous. Furthermore, the experiences of earliest childhood are no longer rated as important for later development as was once the case, and the historian, if he cannot deal with his subject as man to man, at least has the advantage of surveying his whole career and being able to observe the functioning of significant forces.¹³ In any event we historians must, if we are to retain our self-respect, believe that we can do better with the

available evidence than the untrained popular biographer to whom we have so largely abandoned the field.

The historian is, of course, less interested in the individual as such than in the impact of certain individuals upon the society of their time and, beyond that, in the behavior of men as members of the group, society, or culture. This leads us into the domain of social or collective psychology, a subject on which much has been written during the past twenty-five years, especially in this country, but in which progress continues to be slight because of the difficulty of distinguishing satisfactorily between large groups and small groups, between organized and unorganized aggregations, between such vague collectivities as the crowd, the mob, and the mass.¹⁴ Much certainly remains to be done in this area, especially in the elaboration of a theory to bridge the gap between individual and collective psychology.

Freud himself became convinced, at an early date, that his theories might have a certain applicability to historical and cultural problems.¹⁵ He accepted the conclusions of Gustave Le Bon's well-known study of the psychology of crowds (1895) and recognized that a group may develop "a sort of collective mind."¹⁶ As the years went by, his clinical work led him to the conclusion that there were close parallels between the development of the individual and of the race. Thus, the individual's unconscious mind was, in a sense, the repository of the past experiences of his society, if not of mankind.¹⁷ In his most daring and provocative works, *Totem and Taboo* (1913) and his last book, *Moses and Monotheism* (1939), Freud tried to determine the effect of group experience on the formation of a collective group mind.

Anthropologists, like historians, will probably continue to reject Freud's historical ventures as too extravagantly speculative, but the fact remains that anthropological and sociological researches suggest ever more definitely that certain basic drives and impulses, as identified by Freud, appear in all cultures and that the differences between cultures derive largely from varying methods of dealing with these drives.¹⁸ Furthermore, social psychologists are increasingly

aware of the similarity in the operation of irrational forces in the individual and in society.¹⁹ Everett D. Martin, an early but unusually discerning student of the subject, noted in 1920 that the crowd, like our dream life, provides an outlet for repressed emotions: "It is as if all at once an unspoken agreement were entered into whereby each member might let himself go, on condition that he approved the same thing in all the rest." A crowd, according to Martin, "is a device for indulging ourselves in a kind of temporary insanity by all going crazy together,"²⁰ Similarly, Freud's erstwhile disciple, C. G. Jung, has characterized recent political mass movements as "psychic epidemics, i.e. mass psychoses," and others have noted that the fears and rages of mass movements are clearly the residue of childish emotions.²¹

All this, as aforesaid, still requires much further exploration. It does seem, however, that we shall have to learn to reckon with the concept of "collective mentality," even on the unconscious level, and that the traits of that mentality—normally submerged and operative only in association with others or in specific settings—can best be studied as a part of, or extension of, individual psychology. That is to say that progress in social psychology probably depends on ever more highly refined analysis of the individual—his basic motivations, his attitudes, beliefs, hopes, fears, and aspirations.²²

In this connection it is worth recalling our venerable French colleague, Georges Lefebvre's, long-standing interest and concern with the character and role of mobs and crowds in the French Revolution, and especially his impressive study of the mass hysteria of 1789 known as "The Great Fear." Although Lefebvre thought *Le Bon* superficial and confused, he was convinced by his own researches that there was such a thing as a "collective mentality." Indeed, he considered it the true causal link between the origins and the effects of major crises.²³ Without specific reference to psychoanalytic concepts, Lefebvre arrived at conclusions altogether consonant with those of modern psychology. His truly impressive studies have in a sense prefaced the more recent analyses of totalitarian movements which, in my estimation, have clearly

demonstrated the vast possibilities opened to social scientists by the findings of dynamic psychology.²⁴

As historians we must be particularly concerned with the problem whether major changes in the psychology of a society or culture can be traced, even in part, to some severe trauma suffered in common, that is, with the question whether whole communities, like individuals, can be profoundly affected by some shattering experience. If it is indeed true that every society or culture has a "unique psychological fabric," deriving at least in part from past common experiences and attitudes, it seems reasonable to suppose that any great crisis, such as famine, pestilence, natural disaster, or war, should leave its mark on the group, the intensity and duration of the impact depending, of course, on the nature and magnitude of the crisis. I hasten to say in advance that I do not imagine the psychological impact of such crises to be uniform for all members of the population, for if modern psychology has demonstrated anything it is the proposition that in any given situation individuals will react in widely diverse ways, depending on their constitution, their family background, their early experiences, and other factors. But these varying responses are apt to be reflected chiefly in the immediate effects of the catastrophe. Over the long term (which is of greater interest to the historian) it seems likely that the group would react in a manner most nearly corresponding to the underlying requirements of the majority of its members, in other words, that despite great variations as between individuals there would be a dominant attitudinal pattern.

I admit that all this is hypothetical and that we are here moving into unexplored territory, but allow me to examine a specific problem which, though remote from the area of my special competence, is nevertheless one to which I have devoted much study and thought. Freud once stressed the fact that present-day man, living in a scientific age in which epidemic disease is understood and to a large extent controlled, is apt to lose appreciation of the enormous, uncomprehended losses of life in past generations, to say nothing

of the prolonged and widespread emotional strain occasioned by such disasters.²⁵ This is not entirely true, however, of historians of the ancient world who, since the days of Niebuhr, have concerned themselves with the possible effects of widespread disease and high mortality on the fate of Mediterranean civilizations. A strong case has been made for the proposition that malaria, which seems to have first appeared in Greece and Italy in the fourth or fifth centuries B.C., and soon became endemic, led on the one hand to serious debilitation, sloth, and unwillingness to work, and on the other to excitability, brutality, and general degradation. Recent researches suggest that malaria may have been one of the main causes of the collapse of the Etruscan civilization and may have accounted, at least in part, for the change in Greek character after the fourth century, especially for the growing lack of initiative. With reference to the Roman Empire, Professor Arthur Boak has recently reexamined the striking loss of population in the third and fourth centuries A.D. and has attributed it largely to the great epidemics of A.D. 165-180 and 250-280, thus reaffirming the view of Niebuhr and others that the Empire never really recovered from these tragic visitations.²⁶

The literature on these and subsequent epidemics is, however, devoted largely to their medical and sanitational aspects, or at most to their economic and social effects. My primary interest, as I have said, is with the possible long-range psychological repercussions. To study these I think we may well pass over the great plague of Athens in 430 B.C., so vividly reported by Thucydides, and the so-called plague of Justinian of the sixth century A.D., not because they were unimportant but because there is much more voluminous and instructive information about the Black Death of 1348-1349 and the ensuing period of devastating disease.

Western Europe seems to have been relatively free of major epidemics in the period from the sixth to the fourteenth century. It may well be that the revival of trade and the growth of towns, with their congestion and lack of sanitation, facilitated the spread and establishment of the great

mortal diseases like plague, typhus, syphilis, and influenza.²⁷ At any rate, the Black Death was worse than anything experienced prior to that time and was, in all probability, the greatest single disaster ever to have befallen European mankind. In most localities a third or even a half of the population was lost within the space of a few months, yet the great visitation of 1348-1349 marked only the beginning of a long period of pandemic disease with a continuing frightful drain of population. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that for three hundred years Europe was ravaged by one disease or another, or more usually by several simultaneously, the serious outbreaks coming generally at intervals of five to ten years.²⁸ Professor Lynn Thorndike, who thirty years ago wrote in the *American Historical Review* of the blight of pestilence on early modern civilization, pointed out that the period of greatest affliction was that of the Renaissance and Reformation, and especially the years from about 1480 until 1540, during which period frequent severe outbreaks of bubonic plague were reinforced by attacks of typhus fever and by the onset of the great epidemic of syphilis, to say nothing of the English Sweat (probably influenza) which repeatedly devastated England before invading the Continent in 1529. The bubonic plague began to die out in Western Europe only in the late seventeenth century, to disappear almost completely after the violent outbreak at Marseilles in 1720. But the Balkans and Middle East continued to suffer from it until well into the nineteenth century and the pandemic that broke out in India in the 1890's was evidently comparable to the Black Death in terms of mortality and duration.²⁹

The extensive records of the Black Death have long been studied, not only with reference to their medical aspects, but also in connection with the economic and social effects of so sudden and substantial a loss of population. The English population is estimated to have fallen from 3,700,000 in 1348 to 2,100,000 in 1400, the mortality rates of the period 1348-1375 far exceeding those of modern India. While the figures for continental countries are less complete, the available data suggests that the losses were comparable.³⁰ Cities and towns

suffered particularly, but in some areas as many as 40 per cent of the villages and hamlets were abandoned, the survivors joining with those of other settlements or moving to the depopulated towns where opportunity beckoned.³¹ Although a generation ago there was a tendency, especially among English historians, to minimize the social effects of the Black Death, more recent writers like G. G. Coulton acknowledge that the great epidemic, if it did not evoke entirely new forces, did vastly accelerate those already operative.³² The economic progress of Europe, which had been phenomenal in the thirteenth century, came to a halt and was soon followed by a prolonged depression lasting until the mid-fifteenth century and in a sense even into the seventeenth.³³

I make only the most fleeting reference to these questions, because my chief concern, as I have said, is to determine, if possible, what the long-term psychological effects of this age of disease may have been. The immediate horrors of great epidemics have been vividly described by eminent writers from Thucydides to Albert Camus and have been pictured on canvas by famous artists like Raphael and Delacroix.³⁴ At news of the approach of the disease a haunting terror seizes the population, in the Middle Ages leading on the one hand to great upsurges of repentance in the form of flagellant processions and on the other to a mad search for scapegoats, eventuating in large-scale pogroms of the Jews.³⁵ The most striking feature of such visitations has always been the precipitate flight from the cities, in which not only the wealthier classes but also town officials, professors and teachers, clergy, and even physicians took part.³⁶ The majority of the population, taking the disaster as an expression of God's wrath, devoted itself to penitential exercises, to merciful occupations, and to such good works as the repair of churches and the founding of religious houses. On the other hand, the horror and confusion in many places brought general demoralization and social breakdown. Criminal elements were quick to take over, looting the deserted houses and even murdering the sick in order to rob them of their jewels. Many, despairing of the goodness and mercy of God, gave them-

selves over to riotous living, resolved, as Thucydides says, "to get out of life the pleasures which could be had speedily and which would satisfy their lusts, regarding their bodies and their wealth alike as transitory." Drunkenness and sexual immorality were the order of the day. "In one house," reported an observer of the London plague of 1665, "you might hear them roaring under the pangs of death, in the next tippling, whoring and belching out blasphemies against God."³⁷

The vivid description of the Black Death in Florence, in the introduction of Boccaccio's *Decameron*, is so familiar that further details about the immediate consequences may be dispensed with. Unfortunately neither the sources nor later historians tell us much of the long-range effects excepting that in the late nineteenth century a school of British writers attributed to the Black Death fundamental changes in the agrarian system and indeed in the entire social order. The English prelate-historian, Francis Cardinal Gasquet, contended that the great epidemic, with its admittedly high mortality among the clergy, disrupted the whole religious establishment and thereby set the scene for the Protestant revolt. Though this thesis is undoubtedly exaggerated, it does seem likely that the loss of clergy, especially in the higher ranks, the consequent growth of pluralities, the inevitable appointment of some who proved to be "clerical scamps" (Jessopp), and the vast enrichment of the Church through the legacies of the pious, all taken together played a significant role in the development of the church in the later Middle Ages.³⁸

But again, these are essentially institutional factors which may reflect but do not explain the underlying psychological forces. That unusual forces were operative in the later Middle Ages seems highly probable. Indeed, a number of eminent historians have in recent years expatiated on the peculiar character of this period.³⁹ I will not attempt even to summarize the various interpretations of the temper of that age which have been advanced on one side or the other. None of the commentators, so far as I know, have noted or analyzed the connection between the great and constantly recurring epidemics and the state of mind of much of Europe

at that time. Yet the relationship would seem to leap to the eye. The age was marked, as all admit, by a mood of misery, depression, and anxiety, and by a general sense of impending doom.⁴⁰ Numerous writers in widely varying fields have commented on the morbid preoccupation with death, the macabre interest in tombs, the gruesome predilection for the human corpse.⁴¹ Among painters the favored themes were Christ's passion, the terrors of the Last Judgment, and the tortures of Hell, all depicted with ruthless realism and with an almost loving devotion to each repulsive detail.⁴² Altogether characteristic was the immense popularity of the Dance of Death woodcuts and murals, which, with appropriate verses, appeared soon after the Black Death and which, it is agreed, expressed the sense of the immediacy of death and the dread of dying unshriven. Throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries these pitilessly naturalistic pictures ensured man's constant awareness of his imminent fate.⁴³

The origins of the Dance of Death theme have been generally traced to the Black Death and subsequent epidemics, culminating in the terror brought on by the outbreak of syphilis at the end of the fifteenth century. Is it unreasonable, then, to suppose that many of the other phenomena I have mentioned might be explained, at least in part, in the same way? We all recognize the late Middle Ages as a period of popular religious excitement or overexcitement, of pilgrimages and penitential processions, of mass preaching, of veneration of relics and adoration of saints, of lay piety and popular mysticism.⁴⁴ It was apparently also a period of exceptional immorality and shockingly loose living, which we must take as the expression of the "devil-may-care" attitude of one part of the population. This the psychologists explain as the repression of unbearable feelings by accentuating the value of a diametrically opposed set of feelings and then behaving as though the latter were the real feelings.⁴⁵ But the most striking feature of the age was an unusually strong sense of guilt and a truly overwhelming fear of retribution, seeking expression in a passionate longing for effective intercession and in a craving for direct, personal

experience of the Deity, as well as in a corresponding dissatisfaction with the Church and with the mechanization of the means of salvation as reflected, for example, in the traffic in indulgences.⁴⁶

These attitudes, along with the great interest in astrology, the increased resort to magic, and the startling spread of witchcraft and Satanism in the fifteenth century were, according to the precepts of modern psychology, normal reactions to the sufferings to which mankind in that period was subjected.⁴⁷ It must be remembered that the Middle Ages, ignoring the teachings of the Greek physicians and relying entirely upon Scripture and the writings of the Church fathers, considered disease the scourge of God upon a sinful people.⁴⁸ All men, as individuals, carry within themselves a burden of unconscious guilt and a fear of retribution which apparently go back to the curbing and repression of sexual and aggressive drives in childhood and the emergence of death wishes directed against the parents. This sense of sin, which is fundamental to all religion, is naturally enhanced by the impact of vast unaccountable and uncontrollable forces threatening the existence of each and every one.⁴⁹ Whether or not there is also a primordial racial sense of guilt, as Freud argued in his *Totem and Taboo* (1913), it is perfectly clear that disaster and death threatening the entire community will bring on a mass emotional disturbance, based on a feeling of helpless exposure, disorientation, and common guilt.⁵⁰ Furthermore, it is altogether plausible to suppose that children, having experienced the terror of their parents and the panic of the community, will react to succeeding crises in a similar but even more intense manner. In other words, the anxiety and fear are transmitted from one generation to another, constantly aggravated.

Now it has long been recognized by psychologists that man, when crushed by unfathomable powers, tends to regress to infantile concepts and that, like his predecessor in primitive times, he resorts to magic in his efforts to ward off evil and appease the angry deity.⁵¹ It is generally agreed that magic and religion are closely related, both deriving

from fear of unknown forces and especially death, and both reflecting an effort to ensure the preservation of the individual and the community from disease and other afflictions.⁵² Death-dealing epidemics like those of the late Middle Ages were bound to produce a religious revival, the more so as the established Church was proving itself ever less able to satisfy the yearning for more effective intercession and for a more personal relationship to God.⁵³ Wyclif, himself a survivor of the Black Death, is supposed to have been deeply affected by his gruelling experience, and there is nothing implausible in the suggestion that Lollardy was a reaction to the shortcomings of the Church in that great crisis.⁵⁴ In this connection it is also worth remarking that the first expression of Zwingli's reformed faith was his *Song of Prayer in Time of Plague*.⁵⁵

Most striking, however, is the case of the greatest of the reformers, Martin Luther, who seems to me to reflect clearly the reaction of the individual to the situation I have been sketching. Luther left almost a hundred volumes of writings, thousands of letters, and very voluminous table-talk, suggesting an unusually self-analytical and self-critical personality.⁵⁶ From all this material it has long been clear that he suffered from an abnormally strong sense of sin and of the immediacy of death and damnation. Tortured by the temptations of the flesh and repeatedly in conflict with a personalized demon, he was chronically oppressed by a pathological feeling of guilt and lived in constant terror of God's judgment. So striking were these traits that some of his biographers have questioned his sanity.⁵⁷

Here it is interesting to recall that one of our own colleagues, the late Professor Preserved Smith, as long ago as 1913 attacked this problem in an article entitled "Luther's Early Development in the Light of Psychoanalysis."⁵⁸ Smith, who was remarkably conversant with Freudian teaching when psychoanalysis was still in its infancy, considered Luther highly neurotic—probably driven to enter the monastery by the hope of finding a refuge from temptation and an escape from damnation, and arriving at the doctrine of salva-

tion by faith alone only after he had convinced himself of the impossibility of conquering temptation by doing penance. Smith may have overplayed his thesis, but the fact remains that his article was treated with great respect by the Danish psychiatrist, Dr. Paul J. Reiter, who later published a huge and greatly detailed study of Luther's personality. Reiter reached the conclusion, already suggested by Adolf Haus-rath in 1905, that the great reformer suffered from a manic-depressive psychosis, which, frequently associated with genius, involved a constant struggle with, and victory over, enormous psychological pressures. The point in mentioning this is to suggest that Luther's trials were typical of his time. In any event, it is inconceivable that he should have evoked so great a popular response unless he had succeeded in expressing the underlying, unconscious sentiments of large numbers of people and in providing them with an acceptable solution to their religious problem.⁵⁹

I must apologize for having raised so grim a subject on so festive an occasion, but I could not resist the feeling that the problems presented by the later Middle Ages are exactly of the type that might be illuminated by modern psychology. I do not claim that the psychological aspects of this apocalyptic age have been entirely neglected by other students. Indeed, Millard Meiss, a historian of art, has written a most impressive study of Florentine and Sienese painting in the second half of the fourteenth century in which he has analyzed the many and varied immediate effects of the Black Death, including the bearing of that great catastrophe on the religious situation.⁶⁰ But no one, to my knowledge, has undertaken to fathom the prolonged psychological crisis provoked by the chronic, large-scale loss of life and the attendant sense of impending doom.

I would not, of course, argue that psychological doctrine, even if it were more advanced and more generally accepted than it is, would resolve all the perplexities of the historian. Better than most scholars, the historian knows that human motivation, like causation, is a complex and elusive process. In view of the fact that we cannot hope ever to have complete

evidence on any historical problem, it seems unlikely that we shall ever have definitive answers. But I am sure you will agree that there are still possibilities of enriching our understanding of the past and that it is our responsibility, as historians, to leave none of these possibilities unexplored. I call your attention to the fact that for many years now young scholars in anthropology, sociology, religion, literature, education, and other fields have gone to psychoanalytic institutes for special training, and I suggest that some of our own younger men might seek the same equipment. For of this I have no doubt, that modern psychology is bound to play an ever greater role in historical interpretation. There is already a growing readiness to recognize the irrational factors in human development, and to lay increased emphasis on psychological forces. Perhaps the most stimulating non-Marxist interpretation of imperialism, that of the late Joseph Schumpeter, which goes back to 1918, rests squarely on a psychological base and recent treatments of such forces as totalitarianism and nationalism lay great stress on their psychological aspects.⁶¹ Indeed, within the past year two books have appeared which have a direct bearing on my argument. One is T. D. Kendrick's *The Lisbon Earthquake*, which is devoted to a study of the effects of that disaster of 1755 upon the whole attitude and thought of the later eighteenth century. The other is Norman Cohn's *The Pursuit of the Millenium*, which reviews the chiliastic movements of the Middle Ages and comes to the conclusion that almost every major disaster, be it famine, plague, or war, produced some such movement which only analysis of their psychic content will help to explain.

Aldous Huxley, in one of his essays, discusses the failure of historians to devote sufficient attention to the great ebb and flow of population and its effect on human development. He complains that while Arnold Toynbee concerned himself so largely with challenges and responses, there is in the index of his first six volumes no entry for "population," though there are five references to Popilius Laenas and two to Porphyry of Batamaea.⁶² To this I might add that the same

index contains no reference whatever to pestilence, plague, epidemics, or Black Death. This, I submit, is mildly shocking and should remind us, as historians, that we cannot rest upon past achievements but must constantly seek wider horizons and deeper insights. We find ourselves in the midst of the International Geophysical Year, and we all know that scientists have high hopes of enlarging through co-operation their understanding as well as their knowledge of the universe. It is quite possible that they may throw further light on such problems as the influence of sunspots on terrestrial life and the effects of weather on the conduct of human affairs.⁶³ We may, for all we know, be on the threshold of a new era when the historian will have to think not merely in global, but also in cosmic, terms.

Harvard University

1. "Freud and the Arts," *London Times Literary Supplement*, May 4, 1956.
2. *Ibid.* See also Abram Kardiner, *The Psychological Frontiers of Society* (New York, 1945), p. 11; Goodwin Watson, "Clio and Psyche: Some Interrelations of Psychology and History," in *The Cultural Approach to History*, ed. Caroline Ware (New York, 1940), pp. 34-47; Hans W. Gruhle, *Geschichtsschreibung und Psychologie* (Bonn, 1953), p. 7; *The Social Sciences in Historical Study*, Social Science Research Council Bull. No. 64 (New York, 1954), pp. 61 ff.
3. See the article by Henry W. Brosin, "A Review of the Influence of Psychoanalysis on Current Thought," in *Dynamic Psychiatry*, ed. Franz Alexander and Helen Ross (Chicago, 1952), pp. 508-53; Ernest Jones, *What Is Psychoanalysis?* (new ed., New York, 1948), pp. 80 ff.; Iago Galdston, ed., *Freud and Contemporary Culture* (New York, 1957). See also J. A. Gengerelli, "Dogma or Discipline?" *Saturday Review*, Mar. 23, 1957; Gardner Murphy, "The Current Impact of Freud upon Psychology," *Amer. Psychologist*, XI (1956), 663-72; A. Irving Hallowell, "Culture, Personality and Society," in *Anthropology Today*, ed. A. L. Kroeber (Chicago, 1953), pp. 597-620; Clyde Kluckhohn, "The Influence of Psychiatry on Anthropology in American during the Past One Hun-

- dred Years," in *One Hundred Years of American Psychiatry*, ed. J. K. Hall (New York, 1944), pp. 589-618 and "Politics, History and Psychology," *World Politics*, VIII (1955), 112-23; Harold D. Lasswell, "Impact of Psychoanalytic Thinking on the Social Sciences," in *The State of the Social Sciences*, ed. Leonard D. White (Chicago, 1956), pp. 84-115; R. Money-Kyrle, *Superstition and Society* (London, 1939); Walter A. Weisskopf, *The Psychology of Economics* (Chicago, 1955); Erich Fromm, *Psychoanalysis and Religion* (New Haven, 1950); F. J. Hoffman, *Freudianism and the Literary Mind* (Baton Rouge, 1945); Louis Schneider, *The Psychoanalyst and the Artist* (New York, 1950).
4. Raymond B. Cattell, *An Introduction to Personality Study* (London, 1950), pp. 13-14. H. D. Lasswell, *Psychopathology and Politics* (Chicago, 1930), p. 11, refers to "the obscurantist revulsion against submitting the sacred mystery of personality to the coarse indignity of exact investigation." Keats is said to have feared that spectrum analysis would ruin his enjoyment of the rainbow. See Jones, *What is Psychoanalysis?* pp. 12 ff.
 5. Sidney Ratner, "The Historian's Approach to Psychology," *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, II (1941), 95-109.
 6. Edward N. Saveth, "The Historian and the Freudian Approach to History," *New York Times Book Review*, Jan. 1, 1956; Gruhle, *Geschichtsschreibung und Psychologie*, pp. 116 ff.; Richard L. Schoenwald, "Historians and the Challenge of Freud," *Western Humanities Rev.*, X (1956), 99-108.
 7. Brosin, "Review of Influence of Psychoanalysis on Current Thought."
 8. Gruhle *op. cit.*, pp. 127 ff., cites a number of instances from the writings of eminent German historians, and Max Horkheimer, "Geschichte und Psychologie," *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*, I (1932), 125-44, argues the complete inadequacy of the psychological concepts of the classical economists. Alfred M. Tozzer, "Biography and Biology," in *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture*, ed. Clyde Kluckhohn and H. A. Murray (2d ed., New York, 1953), pp. 226-39, plays havoc with the simple-minded biological twist in much biographical writing.
 9. This thought is more or less explicitly expressed by Louis Gottschalk, "The Historian and the Historical Document," in *The Use of Personal Documents in History, Anthropology and Sociology*, Social Science Research Council Bull. No. 53 (New York, 1945), and in *The Social Sciences in Historical Study*. See also Sir Lewis Namier, "Human Nature in Politics," in his *Personalities and Powers* (London, 1955); Schoenwald, "Historians and the Challenge of Freud."
 10. Meyer Shapiro, "Leonardo and Freud: An Art-Historical Study,"

- Jour. Hist. Ideas*, XVII (1956), 147-78, and other critics there cited.
11. Fromm, "Die psychoanalytische Charakterologie und ihre Bedeutung für die Sozial-psychologie," *Zeits. f. Sozialforschung*, I (1932), 253-77, and *Psychology and Religion*, pp. 10 ff.; Karen Horney, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* (New York, 1937), chap. 1; Franz Alexander, *Fundamentals of Psychoanalysis* (New York, 1948), chap. vi; Ralph Linton, *The Cultural Development of Personality* (New York, 1945); Kardiner, *Psychological Frontiers of Society*, esp. chap. xiv; Gerald S. Blum, *Psychoanalytic Theories of Personality* (New York, 1953); Gordon W. Allport, *Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality* (New Haven, 1955); Georges Friedmann, "Psychoanalysis and Sociology," *Diogenes*, No. 14 (1956), 17-35.
 12. Bernard Brodie, in his review of the excellent study of Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House (New York, 1957) by Alexander and Juliette George, notes that the authors, while using very effectively the concepts of psychoanalysis, are scrupulous not to mention the fact. "A Psychoanalytic Interpretation of Woodrow Wilson," *World Politics*, IX (1957), 413-22.
 13. Gruhle, *Geschichtsschreibung und Psychologie*, pp. 127 ff.
 14. Gustave Le Bon, *La psychologie des foules* was published in 1895. The earliest texts, those of William McDougall, *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, and of Edward A. Ross, *Social Psychology*, were first published in 1908. See M. Brewster Smith, "Some Recent Texts in Social Psychology," *Psychological Bull.*, L (1953), 150-59.
 15. Freud's letter to C. G. Jung, July 5, 1910, quoted in Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, II (New York, 1955), 448-49.
 16. Freud, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (New York, 1921).
 17. Jones, *What is Psychoanalysis?* pp. 20 ff.
 18. Geza Roheim, *Psychoanalysis and Anthropology* (New York, 1950).
 19. Kluckhohn, "The Impact of Freud on Anthropology," in *Freud and Contemporary Culture*, pp. 66-72.
 20. *The Behavior of Crowds* (New York, 1920), pp. 35-36. Martin was well versed in the psychoanalytical literature of his time.
 21. Jung, quoted by Ira Progoff, *Jung's Psychology and Its Social Meaning* (New York, 1953), p. ix; Erik H. Erikson, "The First Psychoanalyst," *Yale Rev.*, XLVI (1956), 40-62; Melitta Schmideberg, "Zum Verständnis massenpsychologischer Erscheinungen," *Imago*, XXI (1935), 445-57.
 22. See esp. Fromm, "Über Methode und Aufgabe einer analytischen

- Sozialpsychologie," *Zeits. f. Sozialforschung*, I (1932), 28-54.
23. Lefebvre, "Foules révolutionnaires," in his *Études sur la Révolution Française* (Paris, 1954), pp. 271-87, and *La grande peur de 1789* (Paris, 1932). Philip Rieff, "The Origins of Freud's Political Psychology," *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, XVII (1956), 233-49, is equally hard on Le Bon.
 24. To mention a few titles: Nathan Leites, *A Study of Bolshevism* (Glencoe, Ill., 1953); Gabriel A. Almond, et al., *The Appeals of Communism* (Princeton, 1954); Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York, 1951); the essay by Henry Pachter in *The Third Reich*, ed. M. Baumont, J. H. E. Fried, and E. Verneil (New York, 1955) and the discussion of it by Carl E. Schorske, "A New Look at the Nazi Movement," *World Politics*, IX, (1956), 88-97. See also Hadley Cantril, *The Psychology of Social Movements* (New York, 1941), for a discussion of various modern mass movements, and Raymond A. Bauer, "The Psycho-Cultural Approach to Soviet Studies," *World Politics*, VII (1954), 119-32, for a critical review of several analyses of Soviet society.
 25. Freud, "Thoughts for the Times on War and Death" (1915), in *Collected Papers* (London, 1924-1934), IV, No. 17.
 26. W. H. S. Jones, *Dea Febris: A Study of Malaria in Ancient Italy* (n.p., n.d.) and *Malaria and Greek History* (Manchester, 1909); Jones, Major R. Ross, and G. G. Ellet, *Malaria, a Neglected Factor in the History of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge, 1907); Nello Toscanelli, *La malaria nell'antichità e la fine degli Etruschi* (Milan, 1927), esp. pp. 237 ff.; A. E. R. Boak, *Manpower Shortage and the Fall of the Roman Empire in the West* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1955).
 27. Bernard M. Lersch, *Geschichte der Volksseuchen* (Berlin, 1896), pp. 52 ff.; L. Fabian Hirst, *The Conquest of Plague* (Oxford, 1953), p. 10. It is highly likely that the arrival of rats in Europe in the twelfth century had an important bearing on the spread of bubonic plague. See Hans Zinsser, *Rats, Lice and History* (Boston, 1935), pp. 195 ff.; Major Greenwood, *Epidemics and Crowd-Diseases* (New York, 1937), pp. 289 ff.
 28. August Hirsch, *Handbook of Geographical and Historical Pathology*, trans. Charles Creighton (London, 1883-1885), I, chap. x; Georg Sticker, *Abhandlungen aus der Seuchengeschichte und Seuchenlehre, I, Die Pest* (Giessen, 1908), pp. 74 ff.; Hirst, *Conquest of Plague*, p. 13; Josiah C. Russell, *British Medieval Population* (Albuquerque, N. Mex., 1948), pp. 2, 14 ff.; Lynn Thorndike, "The Blight of Pestilence on Early Modern Civilization," *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, XXXII (1927), 455-74; C. W. Previté-Orton, *Cambridge Medieval History* (Cambridge, 1932), introd.; David A.

- Stewart, "Disease and History," *Ann. Medical Hist.*, N.S., VII (1935), 351-71; Herman B. Allyn, "The Black Death, its Social and Economic Results," *ibid.*, VII (1925), 226-36; the excellent, succinct review by Yves Renouard, "Conséquences et intérêt démographique de la peste noire de 1348," *Population* [Paris], III (1948), 459-66, and "La peste noire de 1348-1350," *Rev. de Paris* (Mar., 1950), 107-19. According to Charles Mullett, *The Bubonic Plague and England* (Lexington, Ky., 1956), p. 18, there were no less than twenty attacks in England in the course of the fifteenth century.
29. Hirsch, *Handbook . . . Pathology*, I, chaps. III, x, XI; II, chap. II; Justus F. K. Hecker, *The Epidemics of the Middle Ages*, trans. B. G. Babington (London, 1844), pp. 188 ff.; Charles Creighton, *A History of Epidemics in Britain* (Cambridge, 1891), I, chap. VIII; Herman Meyer, "Zur Geschichte der Pest im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert," *Schauinsland*, XXVIII (1901), 13-32; Hirst, *Conquest of Plague*, p. 16. It is highly likely that the replacement of the black rat by the brown rat in Europe in the early eighteenth century had an important bearing on the decline of the plague, since the black rat was much more domesticated than the brown (see Zinsser, *op. cit.*, pp. 195 ff.), and it may well be that the growing severity of the European climate, beginning with the late sixteenth century, may have reduced the reproduction rate of the rat flea which is the carrier of the plague bacillus. See Gustaf Utterström, "Climate Fluctuations and Population Problems in Early Modern History," *Scandinavian Econ. Hist. Rev.*, III (1955), 3-47.
 30. Julius Beloch, "Bevölkerungsgeschichte Europas im Mittelalter," *Zeits. f. Socialwissenschaft*, III (1900), 405-23; Russell, *British Medieval Population*, pp. 263 ff., 375, and "Medieval Population," *Social Forces*, XV (1937), 503-11; Renouard, "Conséquences . . . de la peste noire"; Maxim Kowalewsky, *Die ökonomische Entwicklung Europas* (Berlin, 1911), V, 227 ff., 321 ff., 362 ff., 400 ff.
 31. On the desertion of villages and the depopulation of the countryside see Francis A. Gasquet, *The Great Pestilence* (London, 1893), pp. 28 ff., 54, 68, and chaps. ix, x, *passim*; Creighton, *History of Epidemics*, I, 122, 177, 191; Maurice Beresford, *The Lost Villages of England* (London, 1954) who, however, attributes the abandonment of villages to increasing enclosures for grazing, at least in the first instance. By far the best treatments are those of Friedrich Lütge, *Deutsche Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1952), pp. 144 ff., and Wilhelm Abel, *Die Wüstungen des ausgehenden Mittelalters* (2d ed., Stuttgart, 1955).
 32. So far as Germany is concerned the reaction to exaggerated claims

- was first expressed by Robert Hoeniger, *Der Schwarze Tod in Deutschland* (Berlin, 1882), pp. 77 ff. In England the reversal of opinion was brought about largely through the researches of A. Elizabeth Levett, "The Black Death on the Estates of the See of Winchester," *Oxford Stud. in Social and Legal Hist.*, V (1916), 1-120, and was strongly reflected in such writings as Helen Robbins, "A Comparison of the Effect of the Black Death on the Economic Organization of France and England," *Jour. Polit. Econ.*, XXXVI (1928), 447-79. For the best-informed recent evaluations, see Coulton, *The Black Death* (London, 1929), chap. v; also the very judicious review by Eileen E. Power, "The Effects of the Black Death on Rural Organization in England," *History*, N.S., III (1918), 109-16; the basic study for Spain by Charles Verlinden, "La grande peste en Espagne: Contribution à l'étude de ses conséquences économiques et sociales," *Rev. belge de philol. et d'hist.*, XVII (1938), 101-46; and the admirable summaries by Renouard, cited above, fn. 28.
33. So eminent an authority as Wilhelm Abel, "Wachstumsschwankungen mitteleuropäischer Völker seit dem Mittelalter," *Jahrb. f. Nationalökonomie u. Statistik*, CXLII (1935), 670-92, holds that pestilence, famine, and war were not enough to account for the enormous decline in population and that psychological forces, as yet unanalyzed, led to a reluctance to marry and raise a family. E. J. Hobsbawm, "The General Crisis of the European Economy in the 17th Century," *Past and Present* (1954), No. 5, 33-53 and No. 6, 44-65, notes that the economic crisis, which had been in process since about 1300, came to an end at just about the time the plague died out. On the general economic depression see especially M. Postan, "Revisions in Economic History: The Fifteenth Century," *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, IX (1930), 160-67; John Saltmarsh, "Plague and Economic Decline in England in the Later Middle Ages," *Cambridge Hist. Jour.*, VII (1941), 23-41; Edouard Perroy, "Les crises du xiv^e siècle," *Annales*, IV (1949), 167-82, who stresses the fact that the Black Death created a demographic crisis, superimposed on a food crisis (1315-1320) and a financial crisis (1335-1345); Robert S. Lopez, "The Trade of Medieval Europe: The South," *Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, II (Cambridge, 1952), pp. 338 ff.; Postan, "The Trade of Medieval Europe: The North," *ibid.*, pp. 191 ff.; and Lopez's review of M. Mollat's *Le Commerce maritime normand à la fin du moyen âge*, in *Speculum*, XXXII (1957), 386.
 34. Cf. the realistic account in Camus, *La peste* (Paris, 1947), with the contemporary account of the yellow fever epidemic in Philadelphia in 1793 in Howard W. Haggard, *Devils, Drugs and Doctors* (New York, 1929), p. 213. Recent, as yet unpublished, studies

- of modern epidemics by Professors James Diggory and A. Pepitone of the University of Pennsylvania, bear out all the main features of earlier descriptions. Some striking plague paintings are reproduced in Raymond Crawford, *Plague and Pestilence in Literature and Art* (Oxford, 1914).
35. Although the appearance of flagellantism and the beginnings of the Jewish pogroms antedated the Black Death, they reached their fullest development in 1348-1349. See the basic accounts by Karl Lechner, "Die grosse Geisselfahrt des Jahres 1349," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, V (1884), 437-62; of Heinz Pfannenschmid, "Die Geissler des Jahres 1349 in Deutschland und den Niederlanden," *Die Lieder und Melodien der Geissler des Jahres 1349*, ed. Paul Runge (Leipzig, 1900), pp. 89-218; Joseph McCabe, *The History of Flagellantism* (Girard, Kans., 1946), esp. 33 ff.; Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London, 1957), chap. vi. See further Hecker, *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*, pp. 32 ff.; Hoeniger, *Der Schwarze Tod*; Johannes Nohl, *The Black Death* (London, 1926); A. L. Maycock, "A Note on the Black Death," *Nineteenth Century*, XCVII (1925), 456-64. As late as 1884 in Italy physicians were suspected as agents of the rich to poison the poor, and in 1896 British officials in Bombay were charged with spreading the plague. See Melitta Schmideberg, "The Role of Psychotic Mechanisms in Cultural Development," *Internat. Jour. Psychoanalysis*, XI (1930), 387-418; René Baehrel, "La haine de classe au temps d'épidémie," *Annales*, VII (1952), 351-60, who analyzes the popular reaction to the cholera epidemic of 1831-32; and Ilza Veith, "Plague and Politics," *Bull. Hist. Medicine*, XXVIII (1954), 408-15.
 36. The extent of such exodus may be judged from the fact that during the yellow fever epidemic of 1878 about 60 per cent of the population fled the city of Memphis (unpublished MS by James C. Diggory.)
 37. Quoted in Walter G. Bell, *The Great Plague in London in 1665* (London, 1924), p. 22. In addition to the classic accounts of Thucydides (*Peloponnesian War*, Book II) and Boccaccio (*Decameron*, introd.), see also the notes of the great physician, Ambroise Paré, *De la peste in Oeuvres complètes* (Paris, 1841), III, 350-464; Mullett, *op. cit.*, p. 118, on the London plague of 1603; F. P. Wilson, *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* (Oxford, 1927), chap. v on the London plague of 1625. Much evidence is adduced in B. S. Gowen, "Some Psychological Aspects of Pestilence and Other Epidemics," (Winchester, Tenn., 1907; enlarged reprint from the *Amer. Jour. Psychology*, XVIII [Jan., 1907], 1-60); Karl Lechner, *Das grosse Sterben in Deutschland* (Innsbruck, 1884), pp. 93 ff.; and the books of Creighton, Kowalewsky, Heck-

- er, Nohl, Gasquet, and Coulton, all cited above.
38. On the high mortality of the clergy in England see especially Russell, *British Medieval Population*, pp. 222 ff., 367. On the general problem see Gasquet, *Great Pestilence*, pp. exi-exii, 203 ff.; Augustus Jessopp, *The Coming of the Friars and Other Historical Essays* (New York, 1889), pp. 245 ff.; Coulton, *The Black Death*, p. 48, and particularly his chapter on the Black Death in *Medieval Panorama* (New York, 1938); Hoeniger, *Der Schwarze Tod*, pp. 126 ff.; Anna M. Campbell, *The Black Death and Men of Learning* (New York, 1931), 136 ff.; A. Hamilton Thompson, "The Registers of John Gynewell, Bishop of Lincoln, for the years 1349-1350" and "The Pestilences of the 14th Century in the Diocese of York," *Archeol. Jour.*, LXVIII (1911), 301-60, LXXI (1914), 97-154. According to Peter G. Mode, *The Influence of the Black Death on the English Monasteries* (Chicago, 1916), chaps. ii. vi, the heads of at least 120 monasteries had died and some of those who succeeded proved to be veritable gangsters. Verlinden lays great stress on the enrichment of the Church in Spain through donations and legacies.
 39. Johan Huizinga's *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (London, 1927) was, in a sense, the counterpart to Jakob Burckhardt's *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (London, 1878). Of the more recent books the following seem to me particularly significant: Rudolf Stadelmann, *Vom Geist des ausgehenden Mittelalters* (Halle, 1929); Will-Erich Peuckert, *Die grosse Wende. Das apokalyptische Saeculum und Luther* (Hamburg, 1948); Hermann Heimpel, "Das Wesen des Spätmittelalters," *Der Mensch in seiner Gegenwart* (Göttingen, 1954).
 40. Huizinga, *op. cit.*, chap. i; Stadelmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 7, 13; Peuckert, *op. cit.*, pp. 21, 144; Willy Andreas, *Deutschland vor der Reformation* (5th ed., Stuttgart, 1948), p. 202; Otto Benesch, *The Art of the Renaissance in Northern Europe* (Cambridge, 1945), p. 10. In a broad way, Renouard (works noted in fn. 28) and Lucien Febvre ("La peste noire de 1348," *Annales*, IV [1949], 102-103) have suggested the psychological and religious repercussions of the great epidemics. Some authors speak of hysteria, paranoia, and mental disease. See Willy Hellpach, *Die geistigen Epidemien* (Frankfurt, 1905), pp. 84 ff.; Gregory Zilboorg, *A History of Medical Psychology* (New York, 1941), pp. 153 ff.; Norman Cohn, *Pursuit of the Millenium*, p. 73.
 41. See esp. Frederick P. Weber, *Aspects of Death and Correlated Aspects of Life in Art, Epigram and Poetry* (London, 1918), pp. 157 ff.; Erna Döring-Hirsch, *Tod und Jenseits im Spätmittelalter* (Berlin, 1927), *passim*. See also Huizinga, *Waning of the Middle Ages*, chap. xi; Peuckert, *Die grosse Wende*, pp. 95 ff.; and esp.

- Emile Male, *L'Art religieux de la fin du moyen age en France* (Paris, 1908), pp. 375 ff., 423 ff. Paul Perdrizet, *La Vierge de Miséricorde* (Paris, 1908), chap. ix. Michelangelo on one occasion wrote to Vasari: "No thought is born in me which has not 'Death' engraved upon it" (quoted in Piero Misciatelli, *Savonarola* [English trans., Cambridge, 1929], p. 103).
42. See Male, pp. 477 ff.; Millard Meiss, *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death* (Princeton, 1951), esp. chap. ii; Crawford, *Plague . . . in Literature and Art*, chap. viii. On the German painters see Joseph Lortz, *Die Reformation in Deutschland* (3d ed. Freiburg, 1940), I, 102; Benesch, *Art of the Renaissance*, pp. 10 ff.; Arthur Burkhard, *Matthias Grünewald* (Cambridge, 1936), pp. 74 ff.; Gillo Dorfles, *Bosch* (Verona, 1953).
 43. On the artistic side see Crawford, chap. vii; Male, pp. 383 ff.; Curt Sachs, *The Commonwealth of Art* (New York, 1946), pp. 88 ff. See also Andreas, *Deutschland vor der Reformation*, pp. 206 ff.; Stadelmann, *Vom Geist des ausgehenden Mittelalters*, pp. 18 ff.; and the specialized studies of Gert Buchheit, *Der Totentanz* (Berlin, 1926); Henri Stegemeier, *The Dance of Death in Folk-song* (Chicago, 1939); Wolfgang Stämmeler, *Der Totentanz* (Munich, 1948); and the particularly significant historical analysis of Hellmut Rosenfeld, *Der mittelalterliche Totentanz* (Münster, 1954), pp. 33 ff., 59 ff.
 44. The subject is too large to permit of even a cursory analysis, but see Stadelmann, chap. iii; Lortz, I, 99 ff.; Andreas, chap. iii and pp. 191 ff.; and Heimpel, noted above. See also Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism* (12th ed., London, 1930), esp. 453 ff., and "Medieval Mysticism," *Cambridge Medieval History*, VII (New York, 1932), chap. xxvi; Margaret Smith, *Studies in Early Mysticism in the Near and Middle East* (London, 1931), pp. 256-57. As long ago as 1880 the eminent orientalist Alfred von Kremer suggested the connection of mysticism (Sufism) with the great plague epidemics in the Middle East. See his "Über die grossen Seuchen des Orientes nach arabischen Quellen," *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der kais. Akad. Wissenschaften, Wien*, XCVI (1880), 69-156.
 45. James W. Thompson, "The Aftermath of the Black Death and the Aftermath of the Great War," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.*, XXVI (1920-1921), 565-72, on the continuing degeneration.
 46. Wallace K. Ferguson, "The Church in a Changing World: A Contribution to the Interpretation of the Renaissance," *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, LIX (1953), 1-18; review by Kurt F. Reinhardt of Friedrich W. Oedinger, *über die Bildung der Geistlichen im späten Mittelalter* (Leiden, 1953), in *Speculum*, XXXII (1957), 391-92; Lortz, I, 99 ff.; Andreas, pp. 152-53, 169 ff.; and the eloquent pages on the Church in the mid-fourteenth century in Henri Dan-

- iel-Rops, *Cathedral and Crusade: Studies of the Medieval Church, 1050-1350* (London, 1957), pp. 593 ff. Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millenium*, is devoted entirely to a study of the "revolutionary chiliastic movements" in Europe from the Crusades onward.
47. On the triumph of astrology see Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, IV (New York, 1934), 611 ff.; H. A. Strauss, *Psychologie und astrologische Symbolik* (Zurich, 1953); Mark Graubard, *Astrology and Alchemy* (New York, 1953), chaps. iv, v. On the reemergence of pagan superstitions, the practice of magic, and the belief in witches as a heretical sect devoted to worship of the devil and the perpetration of evil see Thorndike, *op. cit.*, IV, 274 ff.; Peuckert, pp. 119 ff.; Andreas, pp. 28 ff.; Joseph Hansen, *Zauberwesen, Inquisition und Hexenprozess im Mittelalter* (Munch, 1900), pp. 326 ff.; Margaret A. Murray, *The Witch-Cult in Western Europe* (Oxford, 1921), esp. pp. 11 ff.; Harmanns Obendiek, *Satanismus und Dämonie in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1928); Montague Summers, *The History of Witchcraft and Demonology* (2d ed., New York, 1956), pp. 1 ff.; Gregory Zilboorg, *op. cit.* It may be noted, for what it is worth, that in the fifteenth century witches were accused of inhibiting human fertility; possibly a reflection of popular concern over the rapidly diminishing population. It is also interesting to observe that witch trials died out in Europe concurrently with the disappearance of the plague in the eighteenth century.
 48. God might, of course, act through natural phenomena such as comets, floods, droughts, or miasma. For a good discussion of this point see G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion*, II (Cambridge, 1927), p. 394; Hirst, *Conquest of Plague*, chap. ii; Kenneth Walker, *The Story of Medicine* (New York, 1955), pp. 71. ff.; and esp. Paul H. Koehler, "The Idea of God in Elizabeth Medicine," *Jour. Hist. Ideas*, XI (1950), 3-29. This explanation was generally accepted through the early modern period and undoubtedly presented a great obstacle to the development of medical and sanitational measures. See Mullett, *Bubonic Plague and England*, pp. 74, 88. Recent studies on modern disasters indicate that it is still widely held, despite the discoveries of Pasteur and his successors. See Martha Wolfenstein, *Disaster: A Psychological Study* (Glencoe, Ill., 1957), pp. 199 ff.
 49. The crucial problem of guilt feelings has not been much studied except by Freud and his successors. See Freud, "Thoughts for the Times on War and Death," (1915) and the succinct discussion in Jones, *What Is Psychoanalysis?* pp. 101 ff., 114. For the continuance of this feeling in modern times see Wolfenstein, *Disaster*, p. 71. Cantril, *The Invasion from Mars* (Princeton, 1940), pp. 161

- ff., quotes one man as saying: "The broadcast had us all worried, but I knew it would at least scare ten years' life out of my mother-in-law."
50. A later explanation of the sense of communal guilt, as it appears among the Jews, was advanced by Freud in his *Moses and Monotheism* (1939). Still another, quite different and quite persuasive, argument is presented by Theodor Reik, *Myth and Guilt: The Crime and Punishment of Mankind* (New York, 1957), esp. pp. 34 ff., 146 ff. Oskar Pfister, *Das Christentum und die Angst* (Zurich, 1944) has examined the relation of anxiety to guilt feelings and the magnification of communal anxieties in the face of disaster. For concrete studies of medieval mass hysteria see Louis F. Calmeil, *De la folie* (Paris, 1845); René Fülöp-Miller, *Leaders, Dreamers and Rebels* (New York, 1935); and esp. the admirable scholarly study of Cohn, *Pursuit of the Millenium*, which stresses the analogies between individual and collective paranoia.
 51. Jung, "After the Catastrophe," *Essays on Contemporary Events* (London, 1947). See also Johann Kinkel, "Zur Frage der psychologischen Grundlagen und des Ursprungs der Religion," *Imago*, VIII (1922), 23-45, 197-241; Henry E. Sigerist, *Civilization and Disease* (Ithaca, 1943), chap. vi; Arturo Castiglioni, *Adventures of the Mind* (New York, 1946), pp. ix, 2, 11, 19; Bronislaw Malinowski, *Magic, Science and Religion* (Boston, 1948), pp. 15, 29, 116; Charles Odier, *Anxiety and Magic Thinking* (New York, 1956), pp. 38 ff.; Melitta Schmideberg: "Role of Psychotic Mechanisms in Cultural Development"; Franz Alexander, "On the Psychodynamics of Regressive Phenomena in Panic States," *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*, IV (1955), 104-11. Hirst, *Conquest of Plague*, has noted the reversion to magic during all great plague epidemics and reports that charms and amulets were never more prevalent among even educated Englishmen than during the epidemic of 1665. Jessopp, *Coming of the Friars*, p. 166, remarked that in his day the threat of any epidemic still brought on "wild-eyed panic" and resort to all kinds of superstitious practices.
 52. James H. Leuba, *The Psychological Origin and the Nature of Religion* (London, 1921), pp. 4, 81; George F. Moore, *The Birth and Growth of Religion* (New York, 1924), pp. 3, 8, 17; W. B. Selbie, *The Psychology of Religion* (Oxford, 1924), p. 32; Malinowski, *Magic, Science and Religion*, p. 29; Willy Hellpach, *Grundriss der Religionspsychologie* (Stuttgart, 1951), pp. 6 ff.
 53. In this connection the great expansion of the cult of the Virgin Mary and even more of her mother, St. Anne, is worth noting; also the fact that among the ten or twelve most popular saints of the late fifteenth century, the so-called "plague saints" (St.

- Anthony, St. Sebastian, St. Roch), were particularly favored. See Huizinga, *Waning of the Middle Ages*, chap. xii; Crawford, *Plague . . . in Literature and Art*, chap. viii; and esp. Male, *Art religieux*, pp. 157 ff., 193 ff. and Perdrizet, *La Vierge de Miséricorde*, *passim*.
54. *The Last Age of the Church*, written in 1356 and first published in 1840, is a violent denunciation of the depravity revealed in the time of the Black Death. It was long believed to have been the first work of Wyclif but is now attributed to an unnamed Spiritual Franciscan. See James H. Todd, *The Last Age of the Church*, by John Wycliffe (Dublin, 1840); J. Foster Palmer, "Pestilences: Their Influence on the Destiny of Nations," *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, I (1884), 242-59; H. B. Workman, *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church* (Oxford, 1926), I, 14; Robert Vaughan, *The Life and Opinions of John de Wyclife* (London, 1928), I, 238 ff.; and, on the general problem, Coulton, *The Black Death*, p. 111, and Mullett, *Bubonic Plague and England*, p. 34.
 55. This very moving appeal for divine aid (1519) is reprinted in Georg Finsler, *et al.*, *Ulrich Zwingli: Eine Auswahl aus seinen Schriften* (Zurich, 1918), pp. 17-19. See also Pfister, *Das Christentum und die Angst*, 321 ff., according to whom Calvin was terror-stricken by the plague and, unlike Luther, was unwilling to stick at his post during severe epidemics. He firmly believed that a group of thirty-four men and women witches had for three years spread the plague in Geneva and that in their case even the most extreme forms of torture were justified.
 56. Karl Holl, "Luthers Urteile über sich Selbst," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, I, *Luther* (Tübingen, 1921); Heinrich Böhmer, *Road to Reformation; Martin Luther to the Year 1521* (Philadelphia 1946), foreword; Karl A. Meissinger, *Der Katholische Luther* (Munich, 1952), p. 2.
 57. Hartmann Grisar, *Luther* (London, 1913-1917), I, 110 ff.; VI, chap. xxxvi, discusses many of these views but Grisar himself takes a more moderate stand. The most recent Catholic biography is that of Joseph Lortz, *Die Reformation in Deutschland*, which is a very model of reasonableness.
 58. *Amer. Jour. Psychology*, XXIV (1913), 360-77.
 59. Hausrath, *Luthers Leben* (Berlin, 1905); Reiter, *Martin Luthers Umwelt, Charakter und Psychose* (Copenhagen, 1937, 1941); Wilhelm Lange-Eichbaum, *Genie, Irrsinn und Ruhm* (4th ed. Munich, 1956), pp. 375-78. See also Walther von Loewenich, "Zehn Jahre Lutherforschung," in *Theologie und Liturgie*, ed. Liemar Hennig (Cassell, 1952), pp. 119-70 and Martin Werner, "Psychologisches zum Klostererlebnis Martin Luthers," *Schweiz. Zeitsch. für Psychologie*, VII (1948), 1-18, who follows Smith's thesis closely.

The argument hinges on the harshness of Luther's upbringing and the extent of his father fixation. Smith noted that on at least one occasion Luther asserted that he had entered the monastery to escape harsh treatment at home. His father's unalterable opposition to this step may have played a part in Luther's later decision to leave the monastery. According to Roland H. Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther* (New York, 1950), pp. 288 ff., Luther's decision (in 1525) to marry was at least in part due to his wish to gratify his father's desire for progeny. Recent writers tend to explain away the harshness of Luther's youth, which indeed was probably less unusual and less important than Smith supposed. See Otto Scheel, *Martin Luther* (Tübingen, 1916); Böhm, *Martin Luther*; Meissinger, *Der katholische Luther*; Robert H. Fife, *The Revolt of Martin Luther* (New York, 1957), pp. 5, 9, 99, 117 ff.; Bainton, *Here I Stand*, pp. 23, 25, 28 and chap. xxi *passim*, who insists that Luther's psychological troubles were of a strictly religious character, due to "tensions which medieval religion deliberately induced, playing alternately upon fear and hope."

60. Meiss, *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death*, while dealing with a restricted subject and a limited period, is in my opinion a masterpiece of synthesis and one of the very few books to recognize the full and varied impact of the Black Death. See also Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance* (Princeton, 1955), II, 479-80.
61. See, for example, Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, and Boyd C. Shafer, *Nationalism: Myth and Reality* (New York, 1955).
62. Huxley, *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* (New York, 1956), p. 221.
63. Fully a generation ago a Soviet scientist thought he could establish an eleven-year cycle of maximum sunspot activity and that these periods were also those of maximum mass excitability as revealed by revolutions and other social disturbances. Furthermore, his correlation of periods of maximum sunspot activity with cholera epidemics in the nineteenth century seemed to reveal a remarkable coincidence. See the summary translation of the book by A. L. Tehijevsky, "Physical Factors of the Historical Process," as read before the American Meteorological Society, December 30, 1926, and now reprinted in *Cycles* (Feb., 1957). Of the many studies of climatic, nutritional, and similar influences on human affairs, see Ellsworth Huntington, *Civilization and Climate* (New Haven, 1915); *The Character of Races* (New York, 1924); *Main-springs of Civilization* (New York, 1946); Willy Hellpach, *Geopsyché* (5th ed., Leipzig, 1939); Louis Berman, *Food and Char-*

acter (Boston, 1932); C. C. and S. M. Furnas, *Man, Bread and Destiny* (Baltimore, 1937); E. Parmalee Prentice, *Hunger and History* (New York, 1939); Josué de Castro, *The Geography of Hunger* (Boston, 1952).

Freud and Wagner-Jauregg.

A Contribution to Freudiana.

by

Hans A. Illing, Ph.D.

Recently a member of the Medical School of the University of Vienna, Dr. Josef Gicklhorn, published a *wissenschaftliche* Notiz, regarding a hitherto unpublished *Gutachten* of Wagner-Jauregg, which the latter wrote in 1919 to the Committee of the Medical Faculty, responsible for making recommendations to the Minister of Education (*Unterrichtsministerium*) for new appointments to the faculty¹. While the *Gutachten* occupies less than one page in the article, Gicklhorn feels it necessary to explain the background of the *Gutachten*, the relationship between Wagner-Jauregg and Freud in the course of the years starting in 1885, when both men simultaneously graduated and received the *Dozentur* in neuropathology, and the history of Freud's life-long frustration at having been excluded from an academic career.

In his article Gicklhorn maintains two theses: (1) Freud was his own worst enemy because of an "unpleasant personality," which made him many enemies, and (2) the alleged pre-World War I anti-Semitism of the medical faculty in Vienna was a "myth." Gicklhorn spends a great deal of effort presenting his evidence that Freud had many enemies for reasons other than having been a Jew, and that the Medical Faculty had no anti-Semitic bias. Wagner-Jauregg's letter, as quoted below, is the author's major evidence in support of Gicklhorn's two theses.

Before presenting Wagner-Jauregg's *Gutachten*, as published by Gicklhorn on July 26, 1957, for the first time, here are some of Gicklhorn's *wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Notizen* regarding l'affaire Wagner - Freud:

(1) The "rediscovery" of the *Gutachten*. The protocol of the debate between Freud and Wagner was taken down stenographically; the debate centered and raged about the contribution, or lack of contribution, of Austrian psychiatrists to the "improvement" (Freud) or the "restoration to active duty" (Wagner) of "shell-shocked" soldiers. The discussion centered around the problem, how the neuroses could be diagnosed, which type of therapy should be applied, and whether medicines, diet, isolation, EST, etc., would produce better results than Freud's "new" psychoanalytic treatment. The question arose: How could psychoanalytic mass-treatment be organized or operated in emergency hospitals with thousands of refugees from the battle fronts? According to Gicklhorn, the ensuing trial (during which the stenographic text was taken down) brought about the break between Wagner and Freud. The lengthy and voluble files would have been destroyed, if they had not been labelled as *archivreif* and been shielded from any and every use till 1968, according to the statutes of the War Archives. However, thanks to the "kind permission" of the Chancellor's Office and the director of the War Archives, the author was able to be the first one and "*ad personam*", on May 20, 1952, to research, utilize, and "exploit" (*auswerten*) these newly discovered files. He copied, photostated, and commented on these files, and published them in "accordance with the rules of the War Archives."

(2) The author's primary motives in publishing, and commenting on, the *Gutachten* are twofold: to dispel the "ancient myth" of the "alleged" (*angeblich*) anti-Semitism within the medical faculty, and to take sides with Wagner-Jauregg, who hitherto had been much "maligned" by Freud and psychoanalysts "all over the world;" the implication being that it was Wagner who really was "friendly" toward Freud (s. *Gutachten*!) and who only "remembers with

bitterness" his old adversary: "(Freud) presented a *Gutachten* about me, which was quite unfavorable" (*Lebenserinnerungen*, p. 73).

As to the relationship of these two men, Gicklhorn often quotes Ernest Jones. One quotation of Jones is from Volume I of his biography of Freud²; it has no other connection with the subject of Freud's relationship with Wagner than the question whether credit for the discovery of the hysterics was due to Freud (as Freud claimed) or due to Freud's much admired teacher, Janet (as Wagner claimed). On another occasion, Jones is quoted as the principal disseminator of the "ancient myth" that "in the highest offices" of Austria anti-Semitism was prevalent and that, therefore, Freud was condemned to eternal frustration in his ambition to become an *ordentlicher Professor*, i.e., a fully appointed professor with rank and pay, instead an *ausserordentlicher Professor*, a title which carried little status or meaning, and no pay. Gicklhorn insinuates that Jones stated there was an organized "clique" designing to (a) prevent the recognition of psychoanalysis and (b) prevent Freud's appointment as an *ordentlicher Professor*. According to Gicklhorn, Jones et al. "openly and clandestinely accused Wagner" of being the head of that clique.

It really takes very little effort to repudiate Prof. Gicklhorn's claim that Jones has made such statements: First, at the time of Gicklhorn's "sensational" publication of the *Gutachten* on July 26, 1957, only two volumes of Jones' biography of Freud had been published. The index of these two volumes lists the name of Wagner precisely five times; all of the listings have reference to meetings only, when Jones mentioned Wagner as one "who was also present" at various meetings. Not a word about the relationship of these two men. Secondly, Jones' third volume, which carries an analysis of the relationship of Freud and Wagner³ was at the time of Gicklhorn's publication of the *Gutachten* in press only, and therefore, certainly unknown to Gicklhorn. Hence Gicklhorn's designation of Jones as the protagonist of the myth of Wagner as the head of the hostile "clique" against

Freud is, to say te least, in error, if not completely a figment of Gicklhorn's imagination.

Speaking of Gicklhorn's attempt to whitewash Wagner from the charge of having been a member of the medical faculty (though not of the commission to whom he presented his *Gutachten* on Freud), as well as the medical faculty as a whole of the "alleged" anti-Semitism, it hardly needs a repudiation. Perhaps most individuals, Jews and Gentiles alike, who ever have been matriculated at a ny German or Austrian university, *including* the University of Vienna, before as well as after World War I, know of the prevailing anti-Semitism both among the students and the faculty; as a matter of record, the medical school of the University of Vienna established a numerus clausus for Jewish students on various occasions. Should Prof. Gicklhorn not have been familiar with this fact?

When Jones' third volume of his biography of Freud went to press, he probably did not know of Wagner's *Gutachten*; when Prof. Gicklhorn published - almost simultaneously - Wagner's *Gutachten*, he did not know of Jones' analysis of Freud and Wagner's relationship, contained in the third volume (23 pp.). Jones states: "Freud's friendliness (toward Wagner) was by no means reciprocated. When (Wagner) wrote his autobiography, he did not only accuse Freud of intolerance, but maintained that, out of revenge for the criticisms emanating from the Psychiatric Clinic he instituted in the Memorandum, he composed for the Commission a personal attack on Wagner-Jauregg; fortunately, this Memorandum is now published, so that readers can see for themselves on which side lay the intolerance. Not content with that, Wagner-Jauregg perpetuated the legend, which had long been thoroughly disproved, that Janet was the true father of psychoanalysis, that Freud had met him at Charcot's Clinic and that the *Studies in Hysteria* were founded on Janet's work. Such statements do not redound to Wagner-Jauregg's credit." Jones' reference to Freud's Memorandum deals with the above-cited debate between Freud and Wagner

regarding World War I's sense "malingerers" and a proposed course of their treatment.

Such is the background which Gicklhorn presents for the rediscovered "bomb-shell" of Wagner-Jauregg's *Gutachten*, which was submitted to the Committee, consisting of v. Krafft-Ebing, Nothnagel, Schroetter, Weichselbaum, Neusser, and E. Ludwig, and designed to prove Wagner as the "true friend" and *Foerderer* of Freud, and which reads as follows:*

*Translated by this writer.

"15.935 C

Prof. Dr. Sigmund Freud certainly belongs to those members of our faculty whose name has enjoyed the widest circulation in the scientific world.

After having worked in the earliest phase of his scientific development primarily in anatomic studies and in research into the organic illnesses of the nervous system, he later turned to research into the functional disorders of the nervous system exclusively.

The starting point of this change of his field was the justifiably sensational work on hysteria which Freud together with Josef Breuer published in 1895.

Freud aimed during the independent development of his ideas, which he put into his work, to explain all the functional disorders of the nervous system and the psyche on the basis of psychological theories which demonstrated his vision and of a dialectic which won him the admiration even of those who did not agree with his theories.

In order to support his *Lehre* he drew not only from the pathological field of human psychology but also from dreams and certain psychological *Fehlreaktionen*, and thus attempted to explain these psychic elements, too, through his skillfully and logically built-up theories.

Freud, moreover, did not just stick to the medico-psychological field, but also endeavored, in accordance with his theories, to penetrate other fields of the *Geisteswissenschaften*, partially to verify his opinions and partially to find explanations for phenomena in these different fields (*fremde Gebiete*).

Although Freud's theories have met with strong opposition (*heftige Bekaempfung*) in many respects, he nevertheless has also gained numerous followers and developers of his

Lehre here and abroad. Even if his *Lehren* should not stand the test during the further progress of science or should have to be modified, and even if, above all, the most ardently opposed therapeutic way which Freud inaugurated on the basis of his theories should be dropped, there are still so many *geistreiche* and valuable cornerstones contained in the building of his *Lehren*, and not just hypotheses but also valuable observations and concepts of relationships, that one could not deny recognition to Freud, even from a partially opposed point of view.

The above-described efforts of Freud extend over a period of 24 years; Freud has already reached the age of 63 years.

Therefore it cannot be said to be premature for an application (*Antrag*) that Freud be awarded the title of *Professor-Ordinarius* and be accorded the *Auerkennung* of the faculty.

Prof. Wagner-Jauregg

Vienna, July 6, 1919."

Although I read the *Gutachten* of Wagner-Jauregg dispassionately, I doubt whether a court would accept such evidence on behalf of the "defendant", Wagner. While the first six paragraphs contain the usual of an academician, with a word of praise here and there (including the first paragraph, in which the author speaks of Freud's name having achieved the "widest circulation" (*weiteste Verbreitung*) rather than fame and honors!), the seventh and eighth paragraphs really seem to speak against, rather than for, the "defendant." Wagner speaks of "different fields" (*fremde Gebiete*), which Freud tried to penetrate, insinuating that these fields were "different" from medicine, even though they were *Geisteswissenschaften*, including alchemy, with which the medical faculty was acquainted in a negative way. In the eighth paragraph Wagner-Jauregg really draws from the hip with both barrels, by clearly indicating - not just insinuating - that psychoanalysis might not stand the test of time (*nicht aufrecht erhalten bleiben*) or even speaking of dropping it (*fallen lassen*)! And Gicklhorn, who uses this *Gutachten* as Exhibit A to show how really friendly Wagner's attitude toward Freud was, mentions a page earlier that, at the time of the writing of the *Gutachten*, 1919, psychoanalysis

had actually won universal acclaim both at home and abroad!

These points in addition to a carefully worded statement, the language of which leaves no doubt where the *Gutachten's* author stood, would have been sufficient to "convince" neutral observers unfamiliar with the field of endeavor of the applicant that Freud was "not qualified" for a professorship. The Committee, however, was well acquainted with Freud and, besides some of the members having anti-Semitic biases (e.g., Krafft-Ebing), certainly were prone to side with their own faculty member, the author of the *Gutachten*.

All told, therefore, it seems to me that Prof. Gicklhorn has proved the opposite of what he set out to do, namely to whitewash Wagner-Jauregg and the medical faculty of the University of Vienna of a guilt which Jones rightly has shown is theirs.

1009 South Orange Drive
Los Angeles, California

Bibliography

1. Gicklhorn, Josef, "Julius Wagner-Jaureggs Gutachten ueber Sigmund Freud und seine Studien zur Psychoanalyse," *Wiener Klinische Wechenschrift*, 69:533-537, 1957.
2. Jones, Ernest, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud, Volume I: The Formative Years and the Great Discoveries, 1856-1900. Volume II: Years of Maturity, 1901-1919*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 428, 1953 and pp. 512, 1955.
3. Jones, Ernest, *The Life of Sigmund Freud. Volume III: The Last Phase, 1919-1939*. New York: Basic Books, 1957.

The Influence of Freud on Anthropology

by

Weston La Barre Ph.D.

Any homage worthy of Freud demands two things: a patient seeking of the human data; and an astringent, disenchanted assessment of things as they are. Few men have had to such a degree as Freud the quality that Henry James's hero sought — that essentially "masculine character, the ability to dare and endure, to know and not to fear reality, to look the world in the face and take it for what it is." If this intransigent maleness of mind has caused many to hate and to fear Freud, it is nevertheless the same quality for which others respect and admire him.

In assessing Freud's influence on anthropology this paper uses three techniques: *statistical* (a self-estimate of anthropologists replying to a questionnaire), *historical* (a recounting of individual influences in the development of the new anthropology), and *bibliographical* (a résumé of official periodicals and texts, and a classified listing of works and representative dynamic-psychological interests). The first source of information is the Fellows of the American Anthropological Association. Because of generous criteria in the Association as to what constitutes a Fellow, this latter group includes without question, and almost exhaustively, all the mature scholars and active teachers in the field of American anthropology. We are further fortunate in having within the field an identifiable body of students — an interest-group rather than a formal "school" perhaps — concerned with a new dynamic kind of anthropology. Some members of this

"culture-and-personality" group either deny or do not know their historical origins in psychoanalytical thinking. In any case, those frankly influenced by analysis we might expect would fall within even a loosely conceived "culture-and-personality" group.

In order to investigate the opinions of Fellows in these matters, the following simple questionnaire was prepared:

I regard myself in general as one of the current culture and personality group

..... Yes No

I have had analytic training for months.

I have read one, five, ten, more
than 10 original sources (Abraham, Ferenczi, Jones,
Freud, Jung, Adler, Rank) of book length in the field.

I have read secondary sources or derivative books.

I teach a course in the general culture and personality area
of interest.

..... Yes No

.....
Name (optional)

The format was that of a stapled double postcard. The reverse of the questionnaire card contained the researcher's university address. Pasted on the attached card was the addressee's name and address, from labels furnished by the Executive Secretary of the Association corrected to October 1955; the reverse of this bore a request to fill in and mail the self-addressed half of the card.

Of 635 questionnaires mailed to Fellows in the United States and Canada, 331 replies were received within precisely one month. Despite the open postcard and the specified option of signing, all but forty of the replies were signed. The results of the inquiry may be conveniently presented in tabular form:

Fellows of the American Anthropological Association

	Analytic Training	Basic Reading			Secondary Sources			Teaching of C/P Courses						
		None	One	Five	Ten	Ten +	Mean	Median	Range	Teach	Do not Have Taught	No answer	Uncertain	
Members of C/P group (n=70)	25 ¹	2 ²	3 ³	14 ⁴	7 ⁵	41 ⁶	37.7	16	0, 4-200	41	24	1	3	1
Non-members of C/P gr. (n = 244)	12 ⁷	25	34	72	17	36	9.1	6	0-100	20	6			
Teachers of C/P Courses														
Teachers of C/P courses (n = 70)	17	1	7	21	7	34	25.7	12.5	4-150	70	224	8	26	3
Analyzands in the American Anthropological Association														
Members of C/P group	25			1	2	21	94.2	75	9-150	16	7	2		
Not members of C/P gr.	12 ^a			3	1	8	49.9	25	9-100 ³	1	10	1		

The quantitative treatment of units as various as human beings must always yield data of but modest depth and reliability. We discovered, with satisfaction, that anthropologists are perhaps as restive of classification as any other group of scholars. Indeed, though courteously yielding enough data to be useful quantitatively, they edified and instructed more in their purely individual statements. From the raw data the following inferences may be drawn. In the first place, considering that many of the Fellows of the American Anthropological Association are archaeologists, linguists, and physical anthropologists — many of whom nevertheless generously responded to an essentially cultural questionnaire — the more than 50% response is indicative of individual interest in the survey. The signing of responses must further be taken as evidence of candor and responsibility.

Considering the variety of scientific interests among Fellows, the fact that between a fourth and a fifth of the Fellows now regard themselves as being in the general culture-and-personality group is highly significant. Others expressed interest and goodwill, though they did not regard themselves as members of the group, whether from not having researched, published and taught in the area, or from having other preeminent scientific interests. A few of the results are obviously to be expected: members of the C/P group are much better read both in basic and in secondary sources (this is true both of total Fellows and of analyzands, viewed as members versus non-members). But one rather astonishing result is that 20 persons who do not regard themselves as members of the C/P group nevertheless teach courses in the general C/P area and six more such persons have taught such courses in the past! One does not quite know how to interpret this result, whether indicating that academic interest in the subject outstrips the number of persons qualified to teach it, or that some persons teach in the area mainly to deny the validity of their subject matter. From comments on replies, it is probable that both are in some measure true.

Possibly self-estimates about reading may throw further

light on the matter. It is our impression that the majority of respondents have inflated notions about the amount of reading they have done in primary and secondary psychoanalytic sources. But whether this is true or not, replies in the lower reading brackets are quite surprizing. One C/P teacher-member states he has doen no basic reading in analysis; two teacher-members had read only one basic source; seven had read only five; and four had read only ten books. This further raises grave question of the qualifications of teachers in the C/P field. The better-read persons tend to teach, according to the tables, but not all teachers are well-read.⁹ Two or three persons wrote vehement comments on the obvious assumption in the questionnaire that persons operating in the culture-and-personality area might legitimately be expected to know something about basic or derivative psychoanalytic literature.

On this point more must be said. In the first place, the data themselves indicate that more than a third of the members of the culture-and-personality group have had personal analyses of varying lengths — which belies any suggestion that culture-and-personality studies “have nothing to do” with psychoanalytic competence and interests. In the second place, it is possible to be quite explicit about the historic intellectual origins of culture-and-personality studies.

Culture-and-personality studies essentially began in the 1930s at Yale University, when Edward Sapir and John Dollard began the first seminar on “Culture and Personality.”¹⁰ Throughout his professional career, John Dollard has been notable for his repeated crossing of departmental lines, being at once sociologist, psychologist, anthropologist, and lay analyst for many years — an “interdisciplinary” team in one person, though he has constantly associated himself with members of each of these groups in his professional researches. Edward Sapir had a great linguist’s almost preternatural *sense of dynamic pattern*. It was he, among the first, who early became restive with traditional Boasian anthropology, which was physical-science oriented, field-data collecting, essentially hostile to all generalizations save those

established in reconstructed diffusionist-history, and on the whole a science of atomistic behaviorism centered on establishing descriptive culture-patterns. There can be no question, in all fairness, of the basic sanity and usefulness of Boasian anthropology. Boas' field-orientation was a healthy counter-attack on armchair theorizing in the social sciences. Indeed, his anti-thory bias has set the tone of American anthropology, which seems to regard as its mission the "cutting down to size" of the great generalizing theories in anthropology that have proceeded in the past almost wholly from England, France, and Germany — all the while that Americans unwittingly borrow theory to incorporate into a complacently rag-tag-and-bobtail "non-theoretical" position.¹¹

Sapir's sense of form and pattern has had profound influence in two important directions: in linguistics in the now-celebrated "Sapir-Whorf hypothesis,"¹² and in ethnology in the culture-and-personality movement. In linguistics, Sapir and his students developed as tools the phonemic concept, the Indoeuropeanist methods of establishing starred forms and primitive linguistic stocks, such quantifiable quests for time-perspective as glottochronology, and the like. In cultural studies, Sapir was convinced that an essential tool for the field worker was a personal "didactic" analysis — which would alert him to a whole new universe of relevance and meaning in his data. He not only listed for reading the works of Freud, Abraham, Ferenczi, Jones, Jung and others; he also actively encouraged many of his students to obtain a psychoanalysis. This latter accounts, to an appreciable degree, for the probably higher percentage of analyzands among anthropologists than among comparable social scientists like sociologists and psychologists. Sapir's own thinking and teaching was unquestionably influenced, and deeply, by Freudian psychoanalysis; and he was until his death a close friend of the late Harry Stack Sullivan, whose own theories of interpersonal relations have been influenced by Sapir. A survey of courses in Culture and Personality, taken from university catalogues eighteen years ago and made by the present writer, showed that by far the majority

of teachers of such courses at that time were Sapir's own students or secondarily influenced by them.

Another trend eventually culminating in culture-and-personality studies began within American anthropology at large, stimulated primarily by Boas himself. In reaction partly to the French collectivist psychology of Durkheim and Levy-Bruhl, field workers began to be interested in the *individual* in the tribe, not merely in monolithic patterns of behavior shared by all. Was individuality as we know it non-existent among primitive peoples? What range of difference could be found among the allegedly standardized members of a primitive society? With his usual provocativeness, Sapir stated the extreme position that "There are as many cultures as there are individuals in the population."¹³

In this period there began, therefore, the collecting of life histories of primitive individuals. Perhaps the most famous was Radin's *Crashing Thunder, the Autobiography of a Winnebago Indian*, but there were in time many others,¹⁴ even though some of them were viewed merely as a new technique for approaching traditional culture-patterns. The most useful guide in the making of such studies is John Dollard's *Criteria for the Life History*. The best critique is Kluckhohn's paper on *The Personal Document in Anthropological Science*.¹⁵

Not all the restiveness with Boasian descriptive ethnography was Sapir's alone, however. Leslie White has also long been an influential and vocal critic of Boas. Likewise, Malinowski's "functionalism" was an independent attempt to go beyond the mere descriptiveness of Boasian anthropology; the same is true of Radcliffe-Brown's social configurationism. But Malinowski never achieved a genuinely dynamic view psychologically. Nor did his active neglect of history satisfy the American anthropologists, who were themselves largely preoccupied with historical reconstructions. Nor, for all his initial impetus, did all culture-and-personality studies remain Sapir's in inspiration, or even exclusively Freudian. Nevertheless, culture-and-personality studies do remain essentially Freudian in concept and outlook — for

which reason they are most often and most vehemently attacked, notably by academic psychologists. But when, like Kluckhohn, we attempt to find examples of inspiration from other schools of psychology — for, after all, in the psychological understanding of culture, *any* psychology would, in theory, be equally available for the purpose — we find almost none. Whiting's *Becoming a Kwoma*¹⁶ while in form a study in Stimulus-Response psychology, was nevertheless influenced by psychoanalysis and by Sapir. Radin predicted in 1929 that Jung would have a greater influence on anthropology than any other of the analytic group, which prediction has far from materialized.¹⁷ The only Rankian influence upon an American anthropologist that we have been able to discover is in a brief paper by Kilton Stewart.¹⁸ Of Adler, only three incidental references are known in the general anthropological literature.¹⁹

An early secondary influence on a large public was the configurationist approach of Ruth Benedict in her *Patterns of Culture*. Reviewed gingerly by Kroeber on its first appearance, this work subsequently has come under repeated professional attack.²⁰ It employs a dated and purely literary Spenglerian-Nietzschean dichotomy of "Apollonian" and "Dionysian" cultures. It is essentially a static Gestaltist picture, untouched by any sense of dynamics either from genetic psychology or from psychoanalysis. Benedict never asked how Zuni children *became* Zuni, and edited, misused or misunderstood such material when she did touch upon it. *Patterns of Culture* has set no tradition and enjoyed no successors, unless the equally-criticized²¹ *Chrysanthemum and the Sword* may be counted as such; it might stand as the last, and brilliant, effort of a purely static descriptive ethnography — except that the literary constraints of the basically dubious Apollonian-Dionysian dichotomy have raised doubts in the minds of most anthropologists as to the accuracy of the book even as descriptive ethnography. A defence, if defence it is, is that in both these books Benedict was not always writing from first-hand field experience, but was using sources secondarily to promulgate a thesis. In

any case, no literary-impressionistic picture of an *ethos*, however brilliant, will satisfy a modern intellectual public, though *Patterns of Culture* has had a phenomenal popular success because of its felicitous literary style.

It was mainly in reaction to such literary impressionism that the Rorschach²² and other projective techniques,²³ group approaches like the Columbia University Research in Contemporary Cultures,²⁴ and interdisciplinary attacks like those of the Yale Institute of Human Relations, the Department of Social Relations at Harvard, and others elsewhere, have been instituted; such research gives added usefulness also to regional specializations like those at Cornell, Michigan, Northwestern, Pennsylvania, Syracuse and elsewhere.

Of greater influence than Benedict, however, both with a lay public and among experts, has been Margaret Mead. Mead has always shown in her work a sharp sense of the ontogenetic origins of character, which Benedict largely lacked, a keener sense of problem, and a better command of method. The influence of Sapir on Mead is obscure, but there is no question of her own origins in psychoanalytic thinking. Abraham, Spitz, and Róheim first focused her interest on psychosexual zones and their importance in personality development, and Mead also acknowledges an intellectual debt to Erik Homburger Erikson.²⁵ From the beginning, her field work has been problem-centered. Eclectic, analytically sophisticated, a fine and perceptive field worker, she has produced voluminously.²⁶ Of enormous and continuing influence are her justly famous *Coming of Age in Samoa* and *Growing up in New Guinea*, and her Balinese and New Guinea studies are too well known to be more than mentioned here. The combined influence of Sapir and Mead has inspired a whole new approach to field work, which emphasizes the dynamic problem of *how the individual acquires* the peculiar culture of his society. The literature of this "culture-and-personality" approach is now formidable;²⁷ it has been partly anthologized by Kluckhohn and Murray, and by Haring,²⁸ and has inspired a number of critiques²⁹ and surveys.³⁰ But if there is one contemporary figure identified in the public mind with

culture-and-personality studies, this is without question Margaret Mead. Probably because of a modified but implicit Freudian inspiration, she is also a major figure of attack. But she stands as well as the pioneer of modern problem-oriented field work, with all its advantages and disadvantages, as over against an older holistic field work. There can be little question of her large and permanent influence on American anthropology.

The Sapir-Sullivan friendship produced no manifest published documents, though it was followed by a number of anthropologist-psychiatrist collaborations, among which might be mentioned that of Mekeel with Erikson, the Henrys, Mirsky and Bunzel with Levy, Aginsky with Wilbur, Chapple with Lindemann, DuBois with Oberholzer, and Kluckhohn with Fries, Alexander and Dorothea Leighton, and H. A. Murray. But the first major collaboration between a psychoanalyst and an anthropologist which eventuated in large-scale theoretical advances was that of Abram Kardiner and Ralph Linton. Linton was one of the great field workers of his generation, but he never pretended to a specialist's psychiatric sophistication. That such psychiatric good sense could be made of his field work was as much of a surprise to Linton as to anyone else; that the gatherer and the interpreter of the data were two different persons also made a deep and lasting methodological impression on otherwise indifferent or skeptical anthropologists. Kardiner's works have been major landmarks in the field of culture-and-personality.³¹

A more controversial, but historically important, figure is Géza Róheim. So far as his reception among American anthropologists was concerned, Róheim had the double disadvantage of a European education and viewpoint in anthropology and a vigorously intransigent orientation to classical psychoanalysis. A field worker and a practicing psychoanalyst, a voluminous writer, it must almost be said that he wrote for an analytically sophisticated audience alone, save for a very few anthropologists. But Sapir, Mead, Devereux, and La Barre have acknowledged Róheim's influence upon them, and his reputation will continue to grow.³² The major

difficulty is that Róheim (like his great mentor Ferenczi) demands a profound and extensive understanding of the psychoanalytic literature for his best appreciation — and this is not commonly come by, among American anthropologists at least. Róheim's field work between 1928 and 1931 was in Somaliland, Central Australia, Normanby Island, and among the Yuma of Arizona. His greatest work, in the present writer's opinion, is *The Origin and Function of Culture*, but his writing was voluminous.³³ Róheim also founded and edited the first three volumes of *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*. His sixtieth-anniversary *Festschrift* was a belated statement of the appreciation in which he had come to be held.³⁴ As Devereux has stated, "Róheim's true stature, as a creator of the first rank in the field of the psychoanalytic study of society and in the field of culture and personality problems, is just beginning to be recognized."³⁵ His awareness that much of culture is an autistic defence mechanism has already taken root in anthropological theory.³⁶

In the analysis-cum-anthropology tradition of Róheim, undoubtedly the major figure today is George Devereux, a brilliant and subtle mind, thoroughly sophisticated analytically, fecund in ideas and articulate in writing of them. He has published widely on an incredible variety of subjects. Among anthropologists he is best known for his series of publications on the Mohave,³⁷ but his papers on theory far outnumber even these. When his Mohave papers are gathered together from their scattered and sometimes obscure sources, and placed in proper ontogenetic order as below, it will readily be seen that Devereux's Mohave are more completely covered on subjects in which the psychiatrist is interested than any other tribe. Like Róheim, Devereux is an intellectuals' intellectual; but there is no doubt in the profession of anthropology that he is the ranking analytically-oriented student in the field.

In the period between 1928 and 1939, Kluckhohn noted the names of Ernest and Pearl Beaglehole, Cora Du Bois, John Dollard, A. I. Hallowell, Scudder Mekeel, and M. E. Opler as anthropologists who have received major influences

from psychiatry.³⁸ In 1948, La Barre stated that — although they are by no means all oriented psychoanalytically — a list of those who had shown in their writings an interest in psychologically-oriented anthropology would have to include Ashley-Montagu, Barton, Dyk, Ford, Gillin, Joseph, Henry, Herskovits, Hill, Johnson, Klineberg, Landes, M. K. Opler, Simmons, Thompson, and Underhill, in addition to those previously mentioned.³⁹ At that date should also be mentioned Belo, Bunzel, Erikson, Gayton, Goldfrank, Gorer, Hoebel, A. H. and D. Leighton, Lesser, G. Newman, E. C. Parsons, H. Powdermaker, Siegel, Speck, Tax, C. and E. W. Voegelin, and J. W. M. and B. B. Whiting — in addition to names already mentioned. There are now over thirty-seven Fellows of the American Anthropological Association who have had a personal psychoanalysis, and this must be viewed as having influenced their work whether they are in the culture-and-personality field or not. In 1958, however, so many persons, well-equipped or ill, regard themselves as followers of the new anthropology that it would be temerarious and unfair to make any statement of their contributions, short of an exhaustive and compendious bibliography. The amount of fine field work — its armamentarium of questions added-to by culture-and-personality insights — is today formidable indeed.

But we run the risk of a biased view. These developments, to a degree, are all *within* the culture-and-personality movement in general. What of a larger and more diffuse influence upon American anthropology as a whole? In answering this question we must again seek some sort of objective indices. For this purpose the best source is undoubtedly the official organs of the American Anthropological Association. Here, however, our conclusions must be somewhat less sanguine, for there has been a very slow acceptance that can be demonstrated. In the *General Index of the American Anthropologist 1888-1928* Freud is not mentioned; but one work of Freud is ever reviewed; and there is no entry under "Psychoanalysis" or the like. In the *Index* for the period 1929-1938, no work is Freud is reviewed; but the

"Subject Index" lists items for 1929 and for 1933 under the rubric "Psychoanalysis and anthropology." In the next decade there is still no listing of Freud, but under "Psychoanalysis and Culture" there is one listing in 1946 for Meggers' attack on culture-and-personality studies, and in 1948 of Devereux' review of Róheim's first volume of *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*.⁴⁰ Scarcely a large official recognition!

In the just-passed eight years (as yet unindexed), however, the content of articles involved with a dynamic viewpoint has increased. In the writer's judgment, perhaps some twenty-eight such articles would fall under this description.⁴¹ Not all were by any means favorable — but at least they do deal with psychological questions critically, and this represents an advance. Encouragingly also, the Book Reviews in the *American Anthropologist* introduced in 1952 a section on "Psychoethnography," inaugurating it with La Barre's review of Barnouw on Chippewa personality,⁴² and continuing it more or less regularly to date.

Another possible criterion of influence might be the mention of indexing of Freud and of psychoanalysis in the standard textbooks in anthropology. Here again the picture is disappointing. Beals and Hoijer, Chapple and Coon, Gillin, Lowie, Shapiro, Slotkin, and Turney-High all list no work of Freud in their bibliographies, and list neither "Freud" nor "Psychoanalysis" in their Indexes. Lowie even managed to write a book on *Social Organization* with all these same omissions!⁴³ In the Boas-edited *General Anthropology* there are only two — and singularly ill-informed — mentions in an article by Gladys Reichard. Goldenweiser lists no books and makes no mention of "Psychoanalysis" in his index, but alone of textbook writers of his generation he makes three informed and generous mentions of Freud. Herskovits, in his first edition, mentions *Totem and Taboo*, and makes two index references to Freud, both of which are critical; his second edition makes several more generous mentions. Hoebel lists *Totem and Taboo* only in his bibliography (which he calls Freud's "unfortunate essay into anthropolo-

gy"), and contains but three index references. In Kroeber's revised edition, he cites his own review of *Totem and Taboo*, and is largely negative in another brief discussion of Freud. Linton merely lists *Totem and Taboo*, but has no index reference to Freud. In his *History of Ethnological Theory*, Lowie ignores Freud both in bibliography and index, but cannot quite manage to pass psychoanalysis by without a disparaging reference to Rivers and a wholly misconceived reference to Malinowski's relationship to Freud, to be discussed later. Titiev, listing no Freud in his bibliography and ignoring psychoanalysis in his index, has one brief mention praising Freud and criticizing his followers.⁴⁴

It is possible to regard the above as merely a demonstration that anthropologists are as much laymen as anyone else in assessing a difficult subject like psychoanalysis. But psychoanalysis fares hardly better in the hands of one better informed. George Peter Murdock states in the preface to his *Social Structure* that he has had fifteen months of analysis; but he remains somewhat ambivalent to psychoanalytic theory. He regards the Oedipus situation as probably universal in the nuclear family, and states that "Freud's theory . . . provides the only available explanation of the peculiar emotional intensity of incest taboos." But at the same time, "we must admit that his ventures into cultural theory are little short of fantastic"; and in another place, after citing Freudian explanations at length, he states that "Freudian theory fails us at this point" — on a question of the family and society! In an extraordinary preface to his book, Murdock writes that psychoanalysis "is probably destined to disappear as a separate theoretical discipline as its findings are gradually incorporated into some more rigorous scientific system such as that of behavioristic psychology" and apologizes to his readers that he has "been compelled to use unassimilated Freudian theory" in discussing avoidance and joking relationships and incest taboos!⁴⁵

Kluckhohn, another important and influential figure among contemporary American anthropologists, also manifests the same tentativeness toward psychoanalysis in his

popular book, *Mirror for Man*. Psychoanalysis is "the first really comprehensive psychological system" and is mentioned respectfully in the "findings of psychoanalysis, anthropology, and the psychology of learning." Yet in another place he imputes an inexactly stated concept to psychoanalysis, and then "criticizes" it with Navaho data. The origin of conscience is in "dread of the community." Kluckhohn is critical of "Freud's assumption of an aggressive instinct," and after mentioning Freud and Einstein on war goes on to discuss "a more scientific approach" of his own.⁴⁶ But in his more professional writing, he is at great pains to achieve a just statement about "Freud and other psychoanalysts [who] have depicted with astonishing correctness many central themes in motivational life which are universal."⁴⁷ Such judicial-mindedness is the more appreciated in a man whose considerable prestige among anthropologists is founded on just such judicial-mindedness and knowledge.

The attitudes of the ranking American anthropologist today, A. L. Kroeber, have been even more interesting and significant. In 1920 Kroeber wrote the first article in an American anthropological journal to discuss psychoanalysis, his famous and influential review of *Totem and Taboo*. His treatment was generous, but critical, concluding that "with all the essential failure of its finally avowed purpose, the book is an important and valuable contribution," and "thus is one that no ethnologist can afford to neglect."⁴⁸ As Kluckhohn has remarked, "Herein Kroeber appeared much wiser than many American anthropologists, down to the present. . . The conventional American anthropologist dismissed Freud's anthropology as bad and his conclusions as worthless. With regrettable but familiar illogic, psychoanalytic method and theory were therewith rejected."⁴⁹ There have been two chief reasons why American anthropologists have virtually unanimously rejected Freud's *Totem and Taboo*. First of all, Freud chose to rely on an older anthropology, that of the English "cultural evolutionists," whose method assumed a psychological unity of mankind in symbolic content, and an analogy with biological evolution which the Americans

had already heavily impugned. This first, if we may so characterize it, was a "Jungian" defect in some of Freud's early ethnological thinking and was compounded further by the assumption that by some sort of "archetypical" memory the sons subsequently through all cultural history remembered the original sin of murder of the father in the "primal horde." Surely this was a "Just-So Story" (Freud's own words, in remarking on Kroeber's review of *Totem and Taboo*). What everyone, anthropologists and psychiatrists alike, should come to see is that *given the nuclear family as a universal human institution, the same conditions for the rise of the typical Oedipus complex exist in every individual and generation*. Anthropologists, like other mere human beings, have of course the same resistances to seeing the reality of the universal Oedipal predicament; but this cannot impugn the scientific fact of the universal incest taboo ethnographically.

This "Jungian" phrasing of a basic ethnographic fact has been most unfortunate, for American anthropologists, again following Kroeber⁵⁰ and their own common knowledge that culture is socially inherited and historically diffused, not biologically inherited as an archetypical mneme, has led them uniformly and universally to reject Jungian psychology on this basic point. Indeed, in a remarkable later review of *Totem and Taboo* nearly two decades later, Kroeber himself stated this matter with entire fairness. If we take the Oedipal predicament, not as one single far-off historical event, but as a typically recurrent situation,

Here we obviously are on better ground. . . Stripped down in this way, Freud's thesis would reduce to the proposition that certain psychic processes tend always to be operative and to find expression in widespread human institutions. Among these processes would be the incest drive and incest repression, filial ambivalence, and the like; in short, if one like, the kernel of the Oedipus situation. After all, if ten modern anthropologists were asked to designate one universal human institution, nine would be likely to name the incest prohibition; some have named it as the only universal one. Anything as constant as this, at least as regards its nucleus, in the notoriously fluctuating universe of culture, can hardly be the

result of "mere" historical accident devoid of psychological significance.⁵¹

Unfortunately, Freud's ambiguity in stating a timeless psychological process as if it were a single historical event, and his casting it in the form of the inheritance of an acquired characteristic as if this did not clash with standard opinion both in biology and in the social sciences, have together constituted an intellectual rationale — in the service of irrational individual resistances — for the rejection of the single most important insight into the nature of culture.⁵²

It is interesting to note how Freud fared with other members of the first generation of anthropologists after Boas. Elsie Clews Parsons, with her insatiable and searching interest in all things anthropological, indicated some knowledge of Freudian theory in a brief note published in 1915 in an analytic journal. In a footnote to a paper first published in 1918, A. A. Goldenweiser also betrayed some knowledge of Freud; and later, in a book, Goldenweiser repeatedly mentioned Freud and devoted space to a systematic *résumé* of theories. But Goldenweiser was an individualist, of a noble and disappearing older breed; and there is little doubt that his status among his fellows suffered somewhat because of his candid and atypical appreciation of Freud.⁵³

Second only to Kroeber, it was another respected contemporary, Lowie, who did most to set the typical American anthropologist's attitude toward psychoanalysis. It is a melancholy chapter in intellectual history, for Lowie — unlike Kroeber — manifestly never came to understand, or even thoroughly to know, the position he attacked. American anthropologists have been peculiarly innocent when it comes to assessing matters of theory, notoriously dependent on others for opinions in such abstruse concerns, and in this trait strangely standardized for otherwise so splendidly maverick a crew. Given the traditional Boasian windmilling at all except historical generalizing in ethnology, it has seemed only to require someone to speak loudly enough in an authoritative voice to set opinion on any matter of theory.

Let him be well- or ill-informed, if only his critique be *negative* — for then a fellow can relax by damning and thenceforth ignoring the whole vexatious theory itself! This is no doubt a serious indictment. However, this has happened not once but many times in American anthropology: a parallel case has been the curiously monolithic and standardized opinion on the Kulturkreislehre School at the hands of Boas — for evidently few others ever read this literature at first hand. It took a fresh assessment by Kluckhohn, who did read the literature, to make us aware of our illiteracy. Another example has been that of totemism. After a lively and fruitful discussion of its problems for some years both in Europe and in America, it took but one ukase from Boas and the subject was dropped, almost never to be discussed in succeeding decades in America. It is worth detailing the still further instance of Freud, and his treatment by Lowie and Malinowski.

In 1920, Lowie gave some space to “refuting” Freud on the mother-in-law taboo. In 1924 he published a book on primitive religion which managed never once to mention Freud or psychoanalysis, or even psychiatry! In 1937, in his standard text on ethnological theory, Lowie further displayed the extent of his knowledge of analysis. He maintained that Rivers (an English medical man much influenced by Freud) “does not seem to have done more than to paraphrase ethnographic facts in psychiatric jargon” — which is less than justice to Rivers, who was one of the pillars of an earlier success of analysis in Britain than in America. Lowie further writes of “Malinowski’s synthesis of psychoanalytic concepts with his ethnographic findings” — which is more than justice to Malinowski. There is doubtless good reason for Lowie’s modesty in saying in his preface that “he is prepared to admit his inability to appraise definitely the latest fashions.” The question is, why, then, did he pretend to do so? Lowie’s statement about Malinowski is absurd. For Malinowski never at any time had any either profound or reliable knowledge of psychoanalysis. Nor was he ever in any sense a synthesizer

of analysis and ethnology. Witness Malinowski himself on the matter:

The observations to be recorded in this chapter were mostly done before my psycho-analytic interest was stimulated. . . It did not take me long to see that dreams did not play the part among the Trobrianders ascribed to them by Tylor and others, and after that I did not trouble much more about them. Later only, stimulated by some literature sent to me by Dr. C. G. Seligman and by his advice, did I begin to test Freud's theory of dreams as the expression of "repressed" wishes and of the "unconscious."

This was the extent of his knowledge, an example of his "testing," and a sample of the quality of his knowledge and understanding. Later on in the same book is a typically oblique reference to psychoanalysis in connection with homosexuality; and the final paragraph of his book is a characteristic Malinowskian mixture of arrogance and ignorance about psychoanalysis. It is difficult to see the grounds for Lowie's statement. *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* and *Crime and Punishment in Savage Society* were both attacks (and are so generally understood) on a poorly understood Freudianism (and this is not so generally known, the more especially since Lowie sets up Malinowski as the arch-exponent of Freud). Both books are of course intellectually irresponsible, or worse, for Malinowski never troubled to become familiar with what he was "testing" or criticizing. As he himself writes, "I have come to realize since the above was written that no orthodox or semi-orthodox psychoanalyst would accept my statement of the 'complex,' or of any aspect of the doctrine" as misconceived by Malinowski. If Malinowski thus mangled psychoanalytic concepts he did not understand, and if so sober and reputable a scholar as Lowie could regard this as a "synthesis of psychoanalytic concepts with his ethnographic findings," what then is the poor student, at fourth hand (and unaccustomed to consult sources on theory in any case), to think of Freud and of psychoanalysis! In his next paragraph, Lowie immediately

embarks upon a savage attack on Malinowski, the supposed exponent of psychoanalysis: whatever relevance it may have to Malinowski personally, it certainly has no relevance to psychoanalysis or to Freud. Lowie knew that Lowie didn't know; but Lowie did not know that Malinowski also didn't know psychoanalysis. To quote Lowie himself, these "apocalyptic utterances," this "battering down wide open doors" is so complex an intellectual shambles that it would be comic were it not that several generations of anthropologists have shaped their opinions on this venerable text.⁵⁴

But there is still another method of assessing the influence of Freud on anthropological matters. This method is to examine the extent to which, unacknowledged or not, Freudian insights have influenced a preoccupation with new subject matters. Since Freud has borne the obliquy and the abuse, there is surely no injustice in imputing to him the impetus to study of dreams. In the general anthropological literature, this has been a considerable preoccupation,⁵⁵ both among British and American "standard" anthropologists, most of them by no means committed to a classic psychoanalytical viewpoint.

Two papers of Freud stimulated a psychoanalytic interest in the materials abundantly available in folklore, and several of his early followers made notable contributions to the study of folklore. Freud himself gives major credit to Riklin, Abraham, Rank, Jones, Storer, and Jung for the early analytic study of folklore and myth.⁵⁶ But without doubt the chief modern analyst of folklore is Géza Róheim, whose voluminous writings contain many analyses of folklore in psychoanalytic terms. Probably the major organ for publication of folkloristic analyses in English is *THE AMERICAN IMAGO*.⁵⁷ Elsewhere, in the classical tradition, have appeared other studies of fairy tales.⁵⁸ Other modern studies are varied. Codellas shows how modern Greek folklore preserves in distorted form etiological myths about anthrax in goat herds; La Barre, using ethnobotanical data, has sought to show how peyote folklore, viewed respectfully in symbolic terms, actually records accurate observations; Zeid

indicates how Egyptian folk literature gives disguised satisfaction of repressed desires and his fellow-countryman El Saggad has studied Egyptian psychology from their folk-songs; M. E. Opler and R. F. Fortune have both written on the symbolism of the snake; and Engle has made a series of fine psychoanalytic studies of classic Greek folklore.⁵⁹ Psychiatrists also have used folkloristic materials for study. Marie Bonaparte has repeatedly written on modern folk myths.⁶⁰ From a psychoanalytic point of view, Moellenhoff has written on Micky Mouse, and Grotjahn on Ferdinand the Bull; Vowinkel-Weigert has made a brilliant study of the cult and mythology of the Levantine mother-goddess, with which should be mentioned Kohen on the Venus of Willendorf, and Ferenczi and Coriat on the Medusa.⁶¹ Karlson wrote an early paper, and Marett a book specifically on folklore and psychology.⁶² Among analytically-influenced American anthropologists, Kluckhohn has written a theoretical paper on mythology; Goldfrank on Hopi, and Jacobs on Chinook myths; Opler and Obayashi showed how current psychological tensions in Japanese internment camps found expression in *senryu* folk-poetry; the content of the "normal unconscious mind" was examined by La Barre through the use of limericks, and the same author has done analytic studies of obscenity and of the popular cartoons of William Steig. Honigmann has also written on obscenity. Charles has shown how the ritual clown's function integrates with local tensions in given societies; Dollard has written on an American Negro tension-reducing game; and Sterba on a Dutch festival, Hallowe'en, and the World War II popular legend that "Kilroy Was Here."⁶³ This sampling of studies does not pretend to be exhaustive but is merely representative of the wide range of subjects that may be illuminatingly treated through the use of a dynamic viewpoint.

A vulgar allegation against Freud is that his psychoanalysis is "culture-bound." The present writer has commented on how poorly-made is this point — particularly since the equally-criticized "biological orientation" of Freud makes psychoanalysis peculiarly well-available for cross cul-

tural studies.⁶⁴ Indeed, Freud was especially aware of the cultural pressures shaping neuroses and psychoses⁶⁵ and has ranged no less in anthropological space than in historical time.⁶⁶ Out of such interests has emerged what might fairly be called the beginnings of a new "Comparative Psychiatry," in a number of studies.⁶⁷ The influence of Sapir and others, arising from an interest in the individual in culture,⁶⁸ has alerted anthropologists to collect detailed psychiatric material on specific cases of neurotics and psychotics in non-Western societies.⁶⁹ Directly in the psychoanalytic tradition is the only fully-reported psychoanalysis of a non-Western individual George Devereux's *Reality and Dream*, the psychotherapy of a "Wolf" Indian — in which, additionally, Devereux develops the interesting thesis of a "culture-area personality" arising from the common elements in the detritus of various Plains cultures.⁷⁰ More numerous are comparative psychiatric materials focused on a specific tribe.⁷¹ Incidental remarks of psychopathological interest are not uncommon in the older ethnographic accounts, of which the following afford a representative sample.⁷² But this is in marked contrast with a modern awareness that cultures *shape and define* psychoses. As early as 1934, Ruth Benedict was struck with the ease with which "abnormals" in our society would function in certain other cultures, concluding that "culture may value and make socially available even highly unstable human types," such as epileptic shamans or homosexual *berdaches*. Her view was that "Each culture is a more or less elaborate working-out of the potentialities it has chosen." Certainly, she felt, "These illustrations force upon us the fact that normality is culturally defined."⁷³ But such relativistic thinking soon brings up the question: what is your baseline, your pan-human norm? Otherwise, how can your clinical labels "paranoid," "megalomaniac" and the like rise above mere cross-cultural name-calling?⁷⁴

In this slowly emerging field of "Comparative Psychiatry," probably the most articulate statements have been those of George Devereux.⁷⁵ But there have been others aware of this problem arising from the collaboration of

psychiatry and anthropology. In 1934, the anthropologist J. M. Cooper wrote on "Mental Disease Situations in Certain Cultures: A New Field for Research"; and in "A Note on Adjustment and Culture" discussed what psychiatrists would term the contrasting "autoplastic" solution of Oriental societies, and the "alloplastic" solution of Western societies.⁷⁶ The psychiatrist Coriat also contributed to this question in a paper on "Psychoneuroses among Primitive Tribes."⁷⁷ Earlier, De La Tourette had glimpsed the same problem.⁷⁸ John Dollard, in 1934, wrote on "The Psychotic Persons Seen Culturally," and L. K. Frank has developed these ideas in several publications, as have Eric Fromm and Karen Horney among psychiatrists.⁷⁹ Among anthropologists who have written on the question are Green, Hallowell, Henry, Honigmann, Hsu, Kroeber, La Barre, Linton, Warner, and Westermarck, in addition to those mentioned previously.⁸⁰ Others who have considered the question include the psychiatrists Kirby, Róheim, Schilder, Skliar and Starikowa, and Von Domarus,⁸¹ and sociologists and psychologists including Klineberg, Smith, and Unwin.⁸²

Of further interest to both psychiatrists and anthropologists are specific studies among primitive groups of alcoholism,⁸³ amok,⁸⁴ arctic hysteria,⁸⁵ and homosexuality among primitives,⁸⁶ latah,⁸⁷ mali-mali,⁸⁸ myriachit,⁸⁹ schizophrenia⁹⁰ and suicide among primitives,⁹¹ tarantism,⁹² the use of drugs,⁹³ and the windigo psychosis.⁹⁴

A further evidence of stimulation from the psychoanalytic movement is a trend among anthropologists to an interest in psychotherapeutic techniques found among primitive peoples.⁹⁵

In sum, from an historical point of view, a great many people, varying in training, have "climbed upon the bandwagon" of culture-and-personality studies. But from another, and perhaps fairer, point of view, the initial impetus of dynamic psychiatry's influence on anthropology has now become generalized — attenuated and diffuse perhaps, but all the more solidly entrenched and accepted by persons of different theoretical persuasions. Many of these do not

know their debt to Freud through Sapir and Róheim, so much has psychoanalysis become part of the climate of thinking. Nevertheless, the awareness that culture is not a mere descriptive congeries of "traits" that mechanically "diffuse" geographically, but is rather a configuration of dynamically meshed and significantly interrelated parts *operating always in individual human beings* — that culture, in short, has psychological dimensions and psychiatric meanings — is here to stay, a revolution accomplished.

But what of the future? Here imagination take flight — for the major premise of the analytically-astute anthropologist must necessarily be that *nothing human can escape illumination* from the penetrating, pan-human, and holistic psychology of Freud. To establish this point, let us take first that anthropological science most improbably susceptible at first blush of yielding analytic insights: archaeology. Here we have only human antefacts and human remains. But if humans have made or ever touched an object, that object is potentially able to communicate to us across time. Already we have a first few brilliant essays in "analytic archaeology." Kohen, for example, remarks on the curiously unspecified features of paleolithic fertility-goddesses, and Heilbronner contrasts the impressionistic profiles of male figures and animals in the Aurignacian period with the magdalenian realistic frontal views of human females (often with the indistinct, schematized faces of the oedipal nightmare) — undoubtedly a change in artistic preoccupation which should yield further insights into social structure when viewed with the Flügel-Taylor hypothesis of sex and social structure in history. Anthony Wallace has done a brilliant "palaeopsychological" reconstruction of the *ethos* of the ancient Maya — by examining their art and sculpture with the eye of modern projective techniques. Doris Webster has given us an uncanny, almost Schileresque insight into the body-image meaning of the signs of the zodiac. Suzanne Bernfeld has left no doubt in our minds about the oedipal meanings of archaeology, and Bryce Boyer has shown us how mere sculptures can tell us much about psychic states.⁹⁶

Probably all Old Stone Age art should be looked at again with an analytically-sophisticated eye. Certainly some properly equipped person should study, in body-image and symbolic terms, the art and the arts of primitive peoples. Why, for example, is the elongated nose attached to the navel or to the penis in many Melanesian masks? What can be discovered analytically about the pig-motif in Melanesian art? What is the meaning of the bird-man symbolism in Oceania, from Melanesia to Easter Island? What are the analytic meanings of the fetishisms in Guinea Coast sculpture? What is the relevance of distortion of proportions in body-image terms in West African sculpture? What meanings can be discovered in the elegant animal-motifs in Scythian art? Might not a psychoanalytically astute person reassess the feline-motif in Chavin, Tiahuanaco and other South American sculpture and religion? And the weeping god of Tiahuanaco and elsewhere? The whole of the rich Middle American art should be looked at again psychoanalytically. Indeed, all primitive art — a peculiarly neglected area in contemporary anthropology — could well be carried beyond mere sterile description.

Primatology and human biology need more psychoanalytic insights. What, for example, are the psychosexual meanings of preferred marriage patterns, of avoidance and joking relationships, of kinship structures, both in nomenclature and in behavior patterns? The psychological processes of raciation, native ideas of "beauty" and selective mating need to be explored. The meaning and therapy of race prejudice, a subject already soundly founded, needs more anthropological-psychiatric exploration. No one has ever exhaustively studied the Southern psychosis of post-Civil War times in this matter.⁹⁷

Since its whole subject matter is symbolism and human structural artefacts, linguistics can also well use a psychoanalytic viewpoint. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis should leave no doubt of the fertility of this field. The linguists Garvin, Trager, and Newman have all done subtle psychological studies on language; and Henry, Goldfrank, and Thorner

have also contributed brief but valuable notes on these matters. In this same general area of symbolic communication, Birdwhistell, Klineberg, and La Barre should be joined by others interested in emotional expression and gesture. Obviously one such interesting study could be made by taking off from the ancient Hindu *Natya*, through Indonesian posture dancing and dance drama, and continuing out into the Oceanic attenuated forms of gesture language.⁹⁸

Basic problems of *process* should be looked at psychoanalytically by anthropologists. What, for example, are the complex psychological factors involved in differential diffusion of traits? What are the hidden symbolic compatibilities and incompatibilities? What are the psychic rationales of culture conflict and culture change? All these matters require psychoanalytic insight for their fuller understanding.

Another area which, like archaeology, would seem unpromising for psychological treatment, is material culture. But Darlington has shown us the psychiatric dimensions of making clay pots! We would like to see further investigations of certain peculiar compulsive mechanisms in the manufacture of basketry in the Southwest. But, indeed, the whole area of primitive economic behavior should be studied psychoanalytically, as Weisskopf has already done for western man. Tausk, Schilder, and Lorand (we believe) are really indispensable to the student comprehensively interested in material culture and inventions. What, for example, is the relation of the body image to invention and discovery? Hanns Sachs' essay on the Greek "delay of the machine age" and Yu-lan Fung's on China's have already shown how much more profound our potential understanding of technology could be through psychoanalysis.⁹⁹

This of course by no means exhausts the relevance of psychoanalysis to the study of material culture. What more could we not learn from a restudy of bodily mutilations, decorations and adornment, concerning the body image, the erotization of body parts, and other finer point of ethos? No comparative study has been made, either, on primitive equivalents of Flügel's brilliant psychology of clothing,

though the material is rich and available. Again, what bearing has the division of labor by sex upon oedipal constellations and social structure? What is the relationship between house-type and sleeping arrangements upon such diverse matters as primal scene mythology, projective religion, and political organization; and how, in specific tribes, are family and kin structure and child care related to the political structure of the state? The analytically sophisticated reader will immediately see from these few examples that it is not a matter of problems but rather the lack of analytic method that alone prevents further work in the area of material culture. If cultures are constructed by human beings, if culture traits are thus functionally interrelated in unexpected ways, and if the unconscious does exist, then the possibilities of insight are wellnigh limitless. That the demanding and difficult analytic method is shared as yet by but few anthropologists need not stem our heuristic enthusiasm for these possibilities.

Primitive literature and religion as projective systems will undoubtedly continue to be the most rewarding of all fields of anthropology for the scholar equipped with analytic tools. Regretably, Jane Harrison came to an awareness of Freud only in the third of her great works on religion, but Cornford and Engle and others will carry forth this tradition in classical studies, the insights of which might well enough be applied also to the study of primitive folklore and literature. No anthropologist henceforth should suppose that he knows enough to write about primitive religion, unless he has read Freud, Jones, Kardiner, Reik, and Weigert.¹⁰⁰ For example, the entire problem of totemism needs to be reopened, and specific studies made of the Egyptian theriomorphic gods, of the Levantine rain-bull of the Neolithic (with its offshoots into East African cattle ritualism, Hindu cow worship, the Minoan-Cretan bull cult, the Orphic-Dionysian bull-murder, and the Roman and Spanish bull-fight), of the complex Semitic pig-totemism, of the worldwide genital mutilations, and of the great intercontinental snake-symbolism and its ancient meanings. Every primitive religious

system deserves, of course, a treatment illuminated by analytic insight — thus far lacking except for the already cited books of Kardiner, the work of Freud and Reik on Judaism, and occasional papers like Daly on Hinduism, and Engle, Weigert, and Cornford on classical Greek subjects. Furthermore, even Christianity is incompletely understood as yet in psychoanalytic terms. And why has no one written a psychoanalytic study of the Southern snake handling cult of contemporary times?

Freud, Alexander and Healy, Fries, Stanton and Stewart, Honigmann, Yap, Lasswell, West, and De Grazia should all be read by anthropologists interested in political organization, the state, and law — perhaps especially Indonesian *adat* and the sophisticated West African legal systems.¹⁰¹ Applied anthropology should look, for various purposes, to Brill, Davidson, Dollard and Harten, Frank, Hadley, Kris and Leites, Maskin and Altman, Rinaldo, Stephenson and Cameron. And the value even to physical anthropology of psychoanalytic insights has only begun to have been shown by La Barre.¹⁰²

One could elaborate almost indefinitely further. What is obviously needed, however, is that all students of all the humanities should ideally have some analytic understanding. If only we have the techniques of insight, then all humanistic data will yield up their secrets, we know not what beforehand. We return to our earlier premise: in the hands of the analytically astute anthropologist and humanist, nothing human can escape illumination from the penetrating, pan-human and holistic psychology of Freud. These are but samples.

Duke University

FOOTNOTES

1. Of member-analyzands, the time (in months of analysis) was: 2, 6 (three persons), 7 (currently), 10, 12 (two persons), over 12, 18 (two persons), 20, 24 (three persons), over 24, 30, 36 (two persons), 48, 60, 72, 84, "many months," and "have been analyzed." All but two signed their names. Most of those with over a year's analysis are prominent and productive workers in the culture-and-personality area.
2. This category was voluntarily added to the questionnaire by respondents. One of these who has done no basic reading teaches in the C/P area.
3. Two of these teach in the C/P area.
4. Seven of these teach in the C/P area.
5. Four of these teach in the C/P area.
6. Of these better-read C/P members, 26 teach C/P courses, 1 has taught, 1 is uncertain, and 14 do not teach such courses.
7. The time (in months of analysis) was: 2, 3, 6, 10 (two persons), 12 (two persons), 24, 42, 36 (two persons), and "several years."
8. One analyzand of three months, not a member of the C/P group writes, "I practiced [lay] analysis both in a hospital clinic and privately 1920-1923; perhaps that is why could not subsequently identify with Cult.-&Pers." Additionally, one MD writes, "I have had psychiatric training for several years. I regard a good deal of the so-called Personality and Culture work as dilettantism or quackery." Readers will draw their own conclusions from both these statements.
9. It is possible that this is a reflection of a professional characteristic. Kluckhohn writes that "To this day, anthropologists as a group are relatively unsophisticated in broad intellectual matters. In large part, this tendency may be traced to a major condition of their intellectual lives: The time which other social scientists may give to work in the library the anthropologist must give to field work, to preparation for field trips, to the study of difficult non-Indo-European tongues. Such attention as the earlier American anthropologists gave to strictly theoretical questions was almost entirely confined to diffusion versus independent invention and various other 'historical' issues" (Kluckhohn, Clyde, "The Influence of Psychiatry on Anthropology in America during the past One Hundred Years," in J. K. Hall, G. Zilboorg and H. A. Bunker (eds.), *One Hundred Years of American Psychiatry*, New York, 1944, pp. 590-591. There is some indication that this tendency is changing among anthropologists in recent years. But the

great glory of Boasian field-oriented anthropology is at the same time its major disadvantage.

10. These facts are knowledgeably and authoritatively established in Kluckhohn's essay, *op. cit.* (footnote 9) pp. 600-605. "To him [Sapir], more than to any other single person must be traced the growth of psychiatric thinking in anthropology" (Kluckhohn, *op. cit.*, p. 601).
11. Leslie White has criticized Boasian anthropology vigorously for a generation, chiefly in the interests of a neo-evolutionism based on Lloyd Morgan. The most recent of many critiques of Boas, listing also earlier sources, is Murray Wax, "The Limitations of Boas' Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* 58 (1956) 63-74.
12. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis had its origins in Sapir's "Conceptual Categories in Primitive Languages," *Science* 74 (1931) 578, contained in D. G. Mandelbaum (ed.), *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir*, Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1949. The thesis was developed in Benjamin L. Whorf's *Collected Papers on Metalinguistics*, Washington, D. C., 1952, and in *Language, Thought and Reality*, New York, 1956. The most important critique of the hypothesis to date is H. Hoijer (ed.), *Language in Culture*, Chicago, 1954, especially the papers by Hoijer and Fearing.
13. Ruth Benedict in "Obituary of Edward Sapir," *American Anthropologist* 41 (1939) 465-468, p. 467. A representative sample of the literature inspired by these questions would include: Beck, W., *Das Individuum bei den Australiern*, Leipzig, Koppers, W., *Individualforschung unter den Primitiven im besonderen unter den Yamana auf Feuerland*, in W. Koppers (ed.) *Schmidt-Festschrift*, Vienna, 1928, pp. 349-365; Lowie, R. H., "Individual Differences and Primitive Culture," *ibid.*, pp. 495-500; Mead, M., "The Role of the Individual in Samoan Culture," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 58 (1928) 481-496; Thurnwald, R., "Werden, Wandel und Gestaltung von Staat und Kultur," in *Die Menschliche Gesellschaft* 4. (1935) sub "Persönlichkeit"; Vierkandt, A., "Führende Individuen bei den Naturvölker," *Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaft* 11 (1908) 1-28; Wallis, W. D., "Individual Initiative and Social Compulsion," *American Anthropologist* 17 (1915) 647-665; and Webster, H., "Primitive Individual Ascendancy," *Publications of the American Sociological Society* 12 (1918) 44-60.
14. *Akiga's Story, the Tiv Tribe as Seen by One of its Members*, London, 1939; Anderson, E. G., *Chief Seattle*, Caldwell [Idaho], 1943; Barrett, S. M. (ed.), *Geronimo's Story of his Life*, Oklahoma City, 1938; Barton, R. F., *Philippine Pagans, the Autobiographies of three Ifugaos*, London, 1938; Beaglehole, E. & P., *Some Modern Maories*, Oxford, 1946; Black Hawk, *Sauk Chief*,

- 1932; Bonnerjea, B., "Reminiscences of a Cheyenne Indian," *Journal de la Société des Americanistes de Paris* 37 (1935) 129-143; Bray, D., *The Life History of a Brannul*, London, 1913; Bryk, F., *Dark Rapture*, New York, 1939; Chao, B. Y., *Autobiography of a Chinese Woman*, New York, 1947; Dyk, W., "A Navaho Autobiography," *Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology* 8, 1947, *The Son of Old Man Hat*, New York, 1938; Eastman, C., *An Indian Boyhood*, New York, 1915; Ford, C. S., *Smoke from their Fires, the Life of a Kwakiutl Chief*, New Haven, 1941; Frazer, D., *Autobiography of an African*, London, 1925; Funkhouser, W. D., *Autobiography of an Old Man, a Study in Anthropology*, 1941; Grant, W., "Megato and His Tribe," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 35 (1905) 266-270, Harrington, M. R., "The Life of a Lenape Boy," *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 3:4; Jenks, A. E., *Childhood of Jishib, the Ojibwa*, 1900; Kidd, D., *Savage Childhood*, London, 1906; King, A. R., "The Dream Biography of a J. Maiden," *Character and Personality* 11 (1943) 227-234; Kluckhohn, C., "A Navaho Personal Document," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1 (1945) 260-283; Landes, R., *The Ojibwa Woman*, New York, 1938; Leighton A. H. & D. G., "Gregorio the Hand-Trembler, a Psychobiological Personality Study of a Navaho Indian," *Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology*, 1949; Linderman, F. B., *Red Mother*, New York, 1932; Marriott, A., *Maria, the Potter of San Ildefonso*, Norman (Oklahoma), 1948; Mathews, J. J., *Wah'Kon-tah, the Osage and the White Man's Road*, Norman, 1932; Michelson, T., "Narrative of an Arapaho Woman," *American Anthropologist* 35 (1933) 595-611, *idem*, "Narrative of a Southern Cheyenne Woman," *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections* 87, 1932, *idem*, "The Autobiography of a Fox Indian Woman," *Annual Report Bureau of American Ethnology* 40, 1925; Mofolo, T., *Chaka*, London, 1931; Ntara, S. Y., *Man of Africa*, London, 1935; Nyabonga, A. K., *The Story of an African Chief*, New York, 1935; Opler, M. E., "Dirty Boy, a Jicarilla Tale of Raid and War," *Memoirs American Anthropological Association* 52, 1938; Perham, M. F. (ed.), *Ten Africans*, London, 1936; Radin, P., "Personal Reminiscences of a Winnebago Indian," *Journal of American Folklore* 26 (1913) 293-318, *idem*, "Crashing Thunder, the Autobiography of a Winnebago Indian," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. 16, no. 7, 1920; Raum, O. F., *Chaga Childhood*, London & Oxford, 1940; Reyer, R. H., *Zulu Woman*, New York, 1948; Sachs, L., *Black Hamlet*, London, 1931; Sapir, E., "The Life of a Nootka Indian," *Queens Quarterly (Canada)* 28 (1921) 232-243, 351-367; Schmidt, P. W., "Die Moderne Ethnologie," *Anthropos* 1

- (1906) 134-163, 318-388, 592-644, 950-997; Simmons, L., *Sun Chief, the Autobiography of a Hopi Indian*, New Haven, 1942; Spicer, E., "Juan Pistola," in *Pascua, a Yaqui Village in Arizona*, Chicago, 1940; Stewart, J. H., "Panatübi," an Owens Valley Paiute," *Bulletin, Bureau of American Ethnology* 119 (1938) 185-195, *idem*, "Two Paiute Autobiographies," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 33, 1934; Underhill, R., "The Autobiography of a Papago Woman," *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association* 46, 1936; Walker, O., "Tiurai, le guérisseur," *Bulletin de la Société des Etudes Océaniques* 10 (1925) 1-35; Wallace, A. F., King of the Delawares, Teedyuscung," Philadelphia, 1949; Wassén, E., "Original Documents from the San Blas Indians, Panama," *Ethnologiska Studier* 6 (1938) 24-69; Waterman, T. T., [Ishi, the last surviving Yahi] in "The Yana Indians," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 13: 35-102; Whitman, W., Xube, a Ponca Autobiography," *Journal of American Folklore* 52 (1939) 180-193; Wissler, C., "Smoking Star, a Blackfoot Shaman," in Parsons, E. C. (ed.), *American Indian Life*, New York, 1922, pp. 45-62; and Zimmerman, C. L., *White Eagle, Chief of the Poncas* 1941.
15. Dollard, J., *Criteria for the Life History*, New Haven, 1935; Kluckhohn, C., "The Personal Document in Anthropological Science," in Gottschalk, L., Kluckhohn, C. and Angell, R., (eds.) *Social Science Research Council Bulletin* 53 (1945) 79-173.
 16. Whiting, J. M. W., *Becoming a Kwoma*, New Haven, 1941.
 17. Radin, P., "History of Ethnological Theories," *American Anthropologist* 31 (1929) 26-30. One Jungian psychiatrist has, however, used ethnological materials: Morgan, William, "Navajo Diagnosticians," *American Anthropologist* 33 (1931) 390-402, *idem*, "Human-Wolves among the Navaho," *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* 11 (1936) 3-43.
 18. Stewart, K. R., "A Psychological Analysis of the Negritos of Luzon," *Man* 39 (1939) 10.
 19. Radin, *op. cit.*, p. 26; Sapir, E., "Personality," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* 12 (1934), p. 86; and Goldenweiser, A., "Some Contributions of Psychoanalysis to the Interpretation of Social Facts," in Barnes, H. E., & Becker, F. B. (eds.), *Contemporary Social Theory*, New York, 1940, pp. 401-402. These references are owed to Kluckhohn, *One Hundred Years*, p. 590, footnote 9.
 20. Aginsky, B. W., "Psychopathic Trends in Culture," *Character and Personality* 7 (1939) 331-343; Codere, H., "The Amiable Side of Kwakiutl Life," *American Anthropologist* 58 (1956) 334-351; Goldfrank, E. S., "Socialization, Personality and the Structure of Pueblo Society," *American Anthropologist* 47 (1945)

- 516-540, *idem*, "A Linguistic Note to Zuni Ethnology," *Word* 2 (1946) 191-196; Hoebel, E. A., *Man in the Primitive World*, New York, 1945, pp. 449-452; Li An-che, "Zuni, Some Observations and Queries," *American Anthropologist* 39 (1937) 63; Opler, M. E., "On Method in the Writing of Anthropologist Monographs," *American Anthropologist* 45 (1943) 329-332, and Wegroeki, H. J., "A Critique of Cultural and Statistical Concepts of Abnormality," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 34 (1939) 166-178. See also the article by Paul Schilder in *Journal of Social Psychology* 15 (1942) 3-21.
21. Beardsley, R., "National Character: the Japanese Talk Back," paper read at the 1952 Meeting of the American Anthropological Association; Bennett, J. W. & Nagai, M., "Echoes: Critique of the Methodology of Benedict's *Chrysanthemum and the Sword*," *American Anthropologist* 55 (1953) 404-411.
 22. The first anthropological use of the Rorschach Test in the field, apparently, was that of D. B. Shimkin on the Wind River Shoshone, but unfortunately it was never published (A. I. Hallowell, *Culture and Experience*, Philadelphia, 1955, p. 384). It is to Hallowell himself that the major credit must be given for pioneering this method in modern culture-and-personality studies. A valuable summary and bibliography of Rorschach work in the field may be found in Henry, J. and Spiro, M. E., "Psychological Techniques: Projective Tests in Field Work," in Kroeber, A. L. (ed.), *Anthropology Today*, Chicago, 1953, pp. 417-429. The following items, not contained in their bibliography, should be added: Caudill, W., "Japanese-American Personality and Acculturation," *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 45 (1952) 3-102; Du Bois, C. & Oberholzer, E., "Rorschach Tests and Native Personality in Alor, Dutch East Indies," *Transactions of the New York Academy of Science* 4 (1942) 168-170; Gladwin, T., and Sarason, S. B., "Truk: Man in Paradise," *Viking Fund Publication in Anthropology*, 20, 1953; Hallowell, A. I., "Rorschach as an Aid in the Study of Personalities in Primitive Societies," *Rorschach Research Exchange* 4 (1940) 106; Henry, J., "Rorschach Technique in Primitive Cultures," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 11 (1941) 230-235; and De Vos, G., "A Quantitative Rorschach Assessment of Maladjustment and Rigidity in Acculturating Japanese Americans," *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 52 (1955) 51-87. The National Research Council's Committee on Primary Records (Division of Anthropology and Psychology), under the editorship of B. Kaplan, will shortly publish a series of "Publications of Primary Records in Culture and Personality." These will contain a large number of unpublished protocols of

Rorschachs, TATs, Mosaic, Drawing and other projective tests, as well as life histories and dreams.

23. Among these may be cited: Abel, T. M., "Free Designs of Limited Scope as a Personality Index: A Comparison of Schizophrenics with Normal, Subnormal and Primitive Culture Groups," *Character and Personality* 7 (1938-9) 50-62; Anastasi, A., & Foley, J. P., "An Analysis of Spontaneous Drawings by Children in Different Cultures," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 20 (1936) 689-726; *idem*, "A Study of Animal Drawings by Indian Children of the North Pacific Coast," *Journal of Social Psychology* 9 (1938) 363-374; Goodenough, F. L., "The Measurement of Mental Functions in Primitive Groups," *American Anthropologist* 38 (1936) 1-11; Henry, W. E., "The Thematic Apperception Technique in the Study of Culture-Personality Relations," *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 35 (1947) 3-135; Henry, J. & Z., "Doll Play of Pilagá Indian Children," *American Orthopsychiatric Association Research Monograph* 4, New York, 1944; Joseph, A., Spicer, R. B. & Chesky, J., *The Desert People: A Study of the Papago Indians*, Chicago, 1949; Joseph, A. & Murray, V. F., *Chamorro and Carolinians of Saipan*, Cambridge, 1951; Kluckhohn, C. and Rosenzweig, J. C., "Two Navaho Children over a Five Year Period," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 19 (1949) 266-278; Leighton, D. & Kluckhohn, C., *The Children of the People*, Cambridge, 1948; MacGregor, G., *Warriors Without Weapons*, Chicago, 1946; Paget, G., "Some Drawings of Men and Women made by Children of Certain Non-European Races," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 62 (1932) 127-144; Róheim, G., "Play Analysis with Normanby Island Children," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 11 (1941) 524-530, "Children's Games and Rhymes in Duau (Normanby Island)," *American Anthropologist* 45 (1943) 99-119; Schubert, A., "Drawings of Orotchen Children and Young People," *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 37 (1930) 232-244; Steggerda, M., "Racial Psychometry," *Eugenical News* 19 (1934) 132-133, "The McAdory Art Test as applied to Navaho Indian Children," *Journal of Comparative Psychology* 22 (1936) 283-285, "Testing Races for the Threshold of Taste, with PTC," *Journal of Heredity* 28 (1937) 309-310, "Form Discrimination Test as given to Navaho, Negro and White School Children," *Human Biology* 13 (1941) 239-246; Steggerda M., & Macomber, E., "Mental and Social Characteristics of Maya and Navaho Indians as evidenced by a Psychological Rating Scale," *Journal of Social Psychology* 10 (1939) 51-59; and Taylor, W. S., "A Note on the Cultural Determination of Free Drawing," *Character and Personality* 13 (1944) 30-36; Thompson, L. & Joseph, A., *The Hopi Way*, Chicago, 1944;

- and Vogt, E. Z., "Navaho Veterans: A Study of Changing Values," *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology* 51, 1952.
24. The earlier work of this group has been reported in La Barre, W., "Columbia University Research in Contemporary Cultures," *Scientific Monthly* 67 (1948) 239-240. Somewhat later is Mead, M., "Research in Contemporary Cultures," in Guetzkow, H. (ed.), *Groups, Leadership and Men*, Pittsburgh, 1951, pp. 106-118. One important publication of the group since Mead's report is Métraux, R. B., and Mead, M., "Themes in French Culture," *Hoover Institute Studies*, Series D, no. 1, Stanford, 1954.
 25. See Mead, M., "The Mountain Arapesh. II. Supernaturalism," *Anthropological Papers of the Museum of Natural History* 37 (1940) 330-331; "Educative Effects of Social Environment as Disclosed by Studies of Primitive Societies," *Environment and Education*, Supplementary Monographs 54, Chicago, 1942. A debt to Róheim is again acknowledged in "Researches in Bali," *Transaction of the New York Academy of Sciences* ser. 2, II, 1-8. "How much of the parallelism in the writings of Benedict, Mead, and Sapir is pure convergence and how much represents the influence of Sapir upon Benedict and Mead is a difficult question. I agree with Goldenweiser ("Leading Contributions of Anthropology to Social Theory," in *Contemporary Social Theory*, p. 489) that a careful reading of *Patterns of Culture* "can leave no doubt that on several occasions Benedict found inspiration in the writings of the late Edward Sapir" (Kluckhohn, *One Hundred Years*, p. 601, footnote 50).
 26. For Mead's own selection of her early papers that are psychoanalytically oriented, see Mead, M., "The Use of Primitive Material in the Study of Personality," *Character and Personality* 3 (1934) 10, fn. 11; for more recent items, see Mead, M. & Bateson, G., "Balinese Character," *New York Academy of Sciences*, Special Publications § 2, 1942. For an historical appreciation of her early work until a decade ago, see Kluckhohn, *One Hundred Years*, pp. 599-600.
 27. Bibliographies of this literature may be found in: Gillin, J., "Personality in Preliterate Societies," *American Journal of Sociology* 4 (1939) 681-702; Meggers, B. J., "Recent Trends in American Ethnology," *American Anthropologist* 48 (1946) 176-214; Kluckhohn, C., "The Personal Document in Anthropological Science," *op. cit.*, footnote 15; La Barre, W., *A Classified Bibliography of the Literature on Culture and Personality* (mimeographed, February 1952); and Devereux, G. & Menninger, K. A. and Devereux, George: *A Guide to Psychiatric Books*. (FIRST EDITION) New York, Grune and Stratton.

28. Kluckhohn C., & Murray, H. A., (eds.) *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture*, New York, 1948; and Haring, D. G. (ed.), *Personal Character and Cultural Milieu*, Syracuse, 1948.
29. Eaton, J. W., "In Defense of Culture-Personality Studies," *American Sociological Review* 16 (1951) 98-100; Endleman, R., "The New Anthropology and its Ambitions: The Science of Man in Messianic Dress," *Commentary*, Sept. 1949, 284-291; Meggers, B. J., *op. cit.* fn. 27; Hsu, F. L. K., *Aspects of Culture and Personality: A Symposium*, New York, 1954; Lindesmith A. R. & Strauss A. L., "A Critique of Culture-Personality Writings," *American Sociological Review* 15 (1950) 587-599; Orlanski, H., "Infant Care and Personality," *Psychological Bulletin* 10 (1949) 1-48. It is notable that the most tendentious critiques of a movement in anthropology tend to come from academic psychologists and sociologists, who often manifest little understanding either of psychoanalysis or of field methods of validation in anthropology.
30. The best surveys of the literature are Inkeles, Alex & Levinson, D. J., "National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Sociocultural Systems," in G. Lindzey (ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2 vols. Cambridge, 1954, ch. 26, II pp. 977-1020; Kluckhohn, C., "Culture and Behavior," in Lindzey, *op. cit.*; and Whiting, J. M. W. & Child, I. E., *Child Training and Personality: A Cross-Cultural Study*, New Haven, 1953 (vol. I). G. H. Seward, *Sex and the Social Order*, New York 1946, makes an able précis of much of the literature until 1946. At the suggestion of the late Ralph Linton, and under the sponsorship of the Viking Fund, an interdisciplinary conference was held in New York in 1947; the proceedings of this conference was issued as *Culture and Personality*, New York, 1949. In a recent encyclopedic compendium of the anthropological sciences are articles by Margaret Mead on "National Character," and A. I. Hallowell on "Culture, Personality, and Society," (Kroeber, A. L. [ed.], *Anthropology Today*, Chicago, 1953, pp. 642-667 and 597-667 and 597-620 respectively). See also Bateson, G., "Cultural Determinants of Personality," in Hunt, J. McV., *Personality and the Behavior Disorder*, New York, 1944.
31. Kardiner, A., *The Individual and His Society*, New York, 1939, and *The Psychological Frontiers of Society*, New York, 1945. See also "The Concept of Basic Personality Structure as an Operational Tool in the Social Sciences," in Ralph Linton (ed.), *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, New York, 1945; also reprinted in Haring, D. G. (ed.), *Personal Character and Cultural Milieu*, Syracuse, (revised edition) 1949, pp. 431-437.

Linton's major works in the culture-and-personality area include:

- "Culture, Society and the Individual," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 33 (1938) 425-436; "The Effects of Culture on Mental and Emotional Processes," *Research Publications of the Association for Research in Nervous and Mental Diseases* 19 (1939) 293-304; "Psychology and Anthropology," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 5 (1940) 115-127; and his short book, *The Cultural Background of Personality*, New York, 1945.
32. For an appreciation of Róheim, see Kluckhohn, *One Hundred Years*, pp. 605-606.
 33. Róheim's chief works are: *Australian Totemism*, London, 1925; *Animism, Magic, and the Divine King*, London, 1930; "The Psychoanalysis of Primitive Cultural Types," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 13 (1932) 1-224; "The Evolution of Culture," *ibid.* 14 (1933) 387-418; *The Riddle of the Sphinx*, London, 1934; *Primitive High Gods* (Supplemental volume to *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 1934); "The Study of Character Development and the Ontogenetic Theory of Culture," in *Essays Presented to C. G. Seligman*, London, 1934, pp. 281-292; "The Psychoanalytic Interpretation of Culture," *IJP* 22 (1941) 147-169; "Transition Rites," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 11 (1942) 336; *The Origin and Function of Culture*, New York, 1943; *The Eternal Ones of the Dream*, New York, 1945; and *Psychoanalysis and Anthropology*, New York, 1950.
 34. G. B. Wilbur & Warner Muensterberger (eds.), *Psychoanalysis and Culture, Essays in Honor of Géza Róheim*, New York, 1951. This volume contains a bibliography of Róheim's works, pp. 455-462.
 35. Devereux, G., "Obituary of Géza Róheim," *American Anthropologist* 55 (1953) 420.
 36. La Barre, W., *The Human Animal*, Chicago, 1954.
 37. Devereux, G., "Mohave Indian Infanticide," *Psychoanalytic Review* (1948) 126-139, "Mohave Indian Obstetrics," *American Imago* 5 (1948) 1-47; "The Mohave Neonate and its Cradle," *Primitive Man* 21 (1948) 1-18; "Mohave Beliefs Concerning Twins," *American Anthropologist* 43 (1941) 573-592; "Post-partum Parental Observances of the Mohave Indians," *Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science* 52 (1949) 458-465; "Mohave Orality," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 16 (1947) 519-546; "Cultural and Characterological Traits of the Mohave Related to the Anal Stage of Psychosexual Development," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 20 (1951) 398-422; "Notes on the Developmental Pattern and Organic Needs of Mohave Indian Children," *Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science* 53 (1950) 178-185; "Mohave Indian Autoerotic Behavior," *Psychoanalytic Review* 37 (1950) 201-220; "The Social and Cultural Implications of Incest among the Mohave Indians," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 8

- (1939) 510-533; "Institutionalized Homosexuality of the Mohave Indians," *Human Biology* 9 (1937) 498-527; "The Primal Scene and Juvenile Heterosexuality in Mohave Society," in *Psychoanalysis and Culture*, pp. 90-107; "Status, Socialization, and Interpersonal Relations of Mohave Children," *Psychiatry* 13 (1950) 489-502; "The Mohave Male Puberty Rite," *Samiksa* 3:11-25; "Heterosexual Behavior of the Mohave Indians," *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences* II, 85-128; "Mohave Paternity," *Samiksa* 3:162-193; "Mohave Soul Concepts," *American Anthropologist* 39 (1937) 417-422; "The Function of Alcohol in Mohave Society," *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 9 (1948) 207-251; "Magic Substances and Narcotics of the Mohave Indians," *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 22 (1949) 110-116; "Psychodynamics of Mohave Gambling," *American Imago* 7 (1950) 1-13; "Mohave Chieftainship in Action," *Plateau* 23 (1951) 33-43; "Mohave Voice and Speech Mannerisms," *Word* 5 (1949) 268-272; "Some Mohave Gestures," *American Anthropologist* 51 (1949) 325-326; "Mohave Etiquette," *Southwest Museum Leaflets* 22 (1948) 1-9.
38. Kluckhohn, *One Hundred Years*, pp. 606-607.
 39. La Barre, W., "Folklore and Psychology," *Journal of American Folklore* 61 (1948) 382-390, p. 387. The list is based on the useful chronologically-ordered bibliography of B. J. Meggers, "Recent Trends in American Ethnology," *American Anthropologist* 48 (1946) 176-214, pp. 197-202.
 40. The *General Index* of the American Anthropological Association publications is published approximately every decade. Those referred to above are: Vol. 32, no. 3, pt. 2, 1930 (for 1888-1928); Vol. 42, no. 4, pt. 3, 1940 (for 1929-1938); and Vol. 53, no. 4, pt. 2, 1951 (for 1939-1948).
 41. Green, A. W., "Culture, Normality, and Personality Conflict," *American Anthropologist* 50 (1948) 225-237; Thompson, L., "Attitudes and Acculturation," 50 (1948) 200-215; Cohen, A. K., "On the Places of 'Themes' and Kindred Concepts in Social Theory," 50 (1948) 436-443; Caudill, W., "Psychological Characteristics of Acculturated Wisconsin Ojibwa Children," 51 (1949) 409-427; Eggan, D., "The Significance of Dreams for Anthropological Research," 51 (1949) 177-198; Voget, F., "A Shoshone Innovator," 52 (1950) 53-63; Wallace, A. F. C., "Psychology and Anthropology in America in 1841," 52 (1950) 287; Little, K. L., "Methodology in the Study of Adult personality and 'National Character' " 52 (1950) 279-282; Paul, B. D., "Symbolic Sibling Rivalry in a Guatemalan Indian Village," 52 (1950) 205-218; Hallowell, A. I., "Personality Structure and the Evolution of Man," 52 (1950) 159-173; Embree, J. F., "A Note on Eth-

- nocentrism in Anthropology," 52 (1950) 430-432; Henry, J., "National Character and War," 53 (1951) 134-135; Spiro, M. E., "Ghosts, Ifaluk, and Teleological Functionalism," 54 (1952) 479-503; Eggan, D., "The Manifest Content of Dreams: A Challenge to Social Science," 54 (1952) 469-485; Mandelbaum, D. G., "On the Study of National Character," 55 (1953) 174-187; Bennett, J. W. & Nagai, M., "Echoes: Reactions to American Anthropology," 55 (1953) 404-411; Shimkin D. B. & Sanjuan, P., "Culture and World View," 55 (1953) 329-348; Mensch, I. N. & Henry, J., "Direct Observation and Psychological Tests in Anthropology," 55 (1953) 461-480; Lurie, N., "Winnebago Berdache," 55 (1953) 708-712; Spiro, M. E., "Human Nature in its Psychological Dimensions," 56 (1954) 19-30; Bourguignon, E., "Dreams and Dream Interpretation in Haiti," 56 (1954) 262-268; James, B. J., "Some Critical Observations concerning Analysis of Chippewa 'Atomism' and Chippewa Personality," 56 (1954) 283-286; Hallowell, A. I., "Southwestern Studies of Culture and Personality," 56 (1954) 685-708; Henry, W. E., "Trukese TATs," 56 (1954) 889; Angelino, H. & Shedd, C. L., "A Note on Berdache," 57 (1955) 121-126; Henry, J. *et al.*, "Projective Testing in Ethnography," 57 (1955) 245-270; Arieti, S., "Some Basic Problems Common to Anthropology and Modern Psychiatry," 58 (1956) 26-39; and Gillin, J., "Ethos Components in Modern Latin American Culture," 57 (1955) 488-500.
42. Barnouw, V., "Acculturation and Personality among the Wisconsin Chippewa," *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association* 72, 1951, in *American Anthropologist* 54 (1952) 249-250.
 43. Beals, R. L., & Hoijer, H., *An Introduction to Anthropology*, New York, 1953; Chapple, E. D. & Coon, C. S., *Principles of Anthropology*, New York, 1942; Gillin, J., *The Ways of Men*, New York, 1948; Lowie, R. H., *An Introduction to Cultural Anthropology*, revised edition, New York, 1940; Shapiro, H. (ed.), *Men, Culture, and Society*, New York, 1956; Slotkin, J. S., *Social Anthropology*, New York, 1950; Turney-High, H. H., *General Anthropology*, New York, 1949; and Lowie, R. H., *Social Organization*, New York, 1948.
 44. Boas, F. (ed.), *General Anthropology*, New York, 1938; Goldenweiser, A. A., *Anthropology*, New York, 1937; Herskovits, M. J., *Man and His Works*, New York, 1948, *Cultural Anthropology*, New York, 1955; Hoebel, E. A., *Man in the Primitive World*, New York, 1949; Kroeber, A. L., *Anthropology*, New York, 1948; Linton, R., *The Study of Man*, New York, 1936; Lowie, R. H., *The History of Ethnological Theory*, New York, 1937; and Titiev, M., *The Science of Man*, New York, 1954.
 45. Murdock, G. P., *Social Structure*, New York, 1949, pp. 12, 280,

- 291, 293 quoted (on universality of Oedipus and incest taboos in the nuclear family); quoted, 292, 294, exii, respectively.
46. Kluckhohn, C., *Mirror for Man*, New York, 1949, quoted pp. 217 and 226; 201; quoted 214, 55, and 54.
 47. Kluckhohn, C., "Universal Categories of Culture," in Kroeber, A. L. (ed.) *Anthropology Today*, Chicago, 1953, pp. 507-523, quoted p. 515 from another publication of Kluckhohn and Morgan. Hallowell, in the same volume (p. 604), writes that "The Freudian model of personality structure and its derivative formulations has provided the most useful constructs so far but not necessarily the final ones." Mead, also in the same volume (pp. 643-644 and 651), mentions the influence of Freudian concepts in theories of "National Character."
 48. Kroeber, A. L., "Totem and Taboo: an Ethnologic Psychoanalysis," *American Anthropologist* 22 (1920) 48-55, quoted pp. 63 and 55.
 49. Kluckhohn, in *One Hundred Years*, p. 594.
 50. Kroeber quite properly scouted "the assumption, apparently typical of the [Jungian] school, and that the symbols into which the 'libido' converts itself are phylogenetically transmitted and appear socially. The machinery of this assumed process is not examined. Its reality is considered established by the adduction of examples which may be so interpreted. Now, if the [Jungians] are right, nearly all ethnology and culture history are waste of effort, except in so far as they contribute new raw materials. If, on the other hand, current anthropological methods and the psychobiological assumptions underlying them are correct, the phylogenetic theories of Jung and his collaborators are only a mistaken exerescence on their sounder work. Mutual understanding will not progress as long as the two tendencies go their conflicting ways in ignorance of each other" (Kroeber, A. L., Review of C. G. Jung, [Collected Papers in] *Analytic Psychology and The Psychology of the Unconscious* [*American Anthropologist* 20, 1918, 323-324, p. 324]). On this question see La Barre, W., "Elementargedanken Noch Einmal?," *American Anthropologist* 57 (1955) 862-863. Whether they are aware of it or not, American anthropologists would probably universally take the Freudian position on symbolism, best expressed by Jones, E., "The Theory of Symbolism," *Papers on Psychoanalysis*, 5th ed., Baltimore, 1948, pp. 87-144.
 51. Kroeber, A. L., "Totem and Taboo in Retrospect," *American Journal of Sociology* 45 (446-451) 1939. Kroeber concludes his review (p. 451), "I trust that this reformulation may be construed not only as an *amende honorable* but as a tribute to one of the great minds of our day. . . We, on our part, if I may speak for ethnologists, though remaining unconverted, have met

Freud, recognize the encounter as memorable, and herewith resalute him." Unfortunately, this honorable statement remains true only of Kroeber himself: most American anthropologists, having accepted the matter at secondhand out of Kroeber's great prestige, have not met Freud and have not encountered his ideas from firsthand reading, certainly not much beyond a cursory look at *Totem and Taboo*.

52. The present writer has argued this question at greater length elsewhere. See La Barre, W., *The Human Animal*, Chicago, 1954, especially chapter 12 "Why Man is Human." See also the same author on "Family and Symbol" in the R  heim *Festschrift* (pp. 156-167 — appropriately in that place because this thinking was to a strong degree influenced by R  heim).
53. Parsons, E. C., "Ceremonial Consummation," *Psychoanalytic Review* 2 (1915) 358-359; Goldenweiser, A. A., *History, Psychology, and Culture*, New York, 1933, p. 67; *idem*, *Early Civilization*, New York, 1922.
54. Lowie, R. H., *Primitive Society*, New York, 1920, pp. 91-94; *idem*, *Primitive Religion*, New York, 1924; *idem*, *The History of Ethnological Theory*, New York, 1937, pp. 172 (on Rivers), 234 (on Malinowski), and vii (on Lowie). These are the only allusions (psychoanalysis and Freud are not discussed at all) in the standard American book on theory. W. H. R. Rivers' books include *Dreams and Primitive Culture*, Manchester, 1917-1918; *Mind and Medicine*, Manchester, 1919; and *Psychology and Ethnology*, New York and London, 1926. Malinowski, B., *The Sexual Life of Savages*, 2 vols., New York, 1929, 2:385 (quoted), 472, and 572; *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*, New York, 1927, p. 75, footnote 1.

Since writing the above, I have come across some almost startling parallels to my judgment on Malinowski. Kluckhohn writes that "to some anthropologists in Europe and to perhaps the majority of the older professionals in the United States Malinowski appeared as little better than a pretentious Messiah of the credulous" (Kluckhohn, C., "Bronislaw Malinowski 1884-1942," *Journal of American Folklore* 56 [1943] 208-219, p. 208). Kluckhohn accuses Malinowski of "flamboyant flogging of dead horses," Lowie taxes him with an "adolescent eagerness to shock the ethnological bourgeois" (in Kluckhohn, p. 209). Kluckhohn concludes that one of the "great weaknesses in Malinowski's theory [was] the lack of a workable psychology. . . . As for psychology, Malinowski remained rooted in an outmoded behaviorism. His publications show no mastery of contemporary learning theory. Psychoanalytic theory he influenced importantly [?], but he was never analyzed, and psychoanalysis failed to become part of his

- systematic thinking" (Kluckhohn, p. 216). Strangely enough, Malinowski even uses the word "irresponsibility" of himself! (Foreword to *The Sexual Life of Savages*, London 1932, p. xxix).
55. Elwin, V., "A Note on the Theory and Symbolism of Dreams among the Baiga," *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 16 (1937) 237-259; Firth, R., "The Meaning of Dreams in Tikopia," in *Essays Presented to C. G. Seligman*, London, 1934; Hallowell, A. I., "Freudian Symbolism in the Dream of a Saulteaux Indian Man," *Journal of Social Psychology* 9 (1938) 47-48; Handy, E. S. C., "Dreaming in Relation to Spirit Kindred and Sickness in Hawaii," in *Essays in Honor of A. L. Kroeber*, Berkeley, 1936, pp. 119-127; King, A. R., "The Dream Biography of a J Maiden," *Character and Personality* 11 (1943) 227-234; Luomala, K., "Dreams and Dream Interpretations of the Diegueno Indians of Southern California," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 5 (1936) 195-225; Morgan, W., "Navaho Dreams," *American Anthropologist* 34 (1932) 390-405; Radin, P., "Ojibway and Ottawa Puberty Dreams," in the Kroeber *Festschrift*, op. cit., pp. 233-264; Schneider, D. M., "An Analysis of Yir Yoront Dreams," (mss.); Spencer, D. M., "Fijian Dreams and Visions," in Davidson, D. S. (ed.), *Twenty-fifth Anniversary Studies*, Philadelphia, 1937, pp. 199-209; and Wallace, A. F. C., "The Dream in Mohave Life," *Journal of American Folklore* 60 (1947) 252-258. To this list should be added the studies of D. Eggan (cited in footnote 41) and the frequent use of dream materials in the works of Devereux and R  heim. The chief book on the subject is Lincoln, J. S., *The Dream in Primitive Cultures*, London, 1935.
 56. Freud, S., "The Occurrence in Dreams of Material from Fairy Tales" (*Coll. Pap.* IV, 236-243) and "The Theme of the Three Caskets" (*ibid.*, 244-256).
 Abraham, Karl, *Dreams and Myths* (Nervous and Mental Disease Monograph Series, no. 15, 1913); Rank, Otto, *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero* (N&MDS, no. 18, 1913), *Das Inzestmotiv in Dichtung und Sage* (Vienna, 1912); Jones, Ernest, "The Symbolic Significance of Salt in Folklore and Superstition" (Ch. IV, in *Essays in Applied Psychoanalysis* [London, 1923]); Riklin, Franz, *Wishfulfillment and Symbolism in Fairy Tales* (N&MDM, no. 21, 1915).
 Freud, S., in *Collected Papers* I, p. 320. A summary of works up to 1948 may be found in La Barre, W., "Folklore and Psychology," *Journal of American Folklore* (1948) 382-390. The following footnote lists items published after 1948.
 57. In this periodical have appeared the following studies: Tarachow, Sidney, "Totem Feast in Modern Dress," 5 (1948) 65-69; Cox, H. L., "The Place of Mythology in the Study of Culture," 5

- (1948) 83-94; Sterba, Richard, "Kilroy Was Here," 5 (1948) 173-191, "On Hallowe'en," 5 (1948) 213-224; Fraiberg, L. & S., "Hallowe'en: Ritual and Myth," 8 (1950) 289-328; Desmonde, W. H., "Jack and the Beanstalk," 8 (1951) 287-288, "The Bull-Fight as a Religious Ritual," 9 (1952) 173-195; Róheim, G., "The Evil Eye," 10 (1952) 351-363, "The Language of Birds," 10 (1952) 3-14; Zelig, D. F., "Two Episodes in the Life of Jacob," 10 (1952) 181-203
58. Ferenczi, S., "Gulliver Fantasies," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 9 (1928) 283-300; Lorand, S., "Fairy Tales and Neurosis," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 4 (1935) 234-243, "Fairy Tales, Lilliputian Dreams, and Neurosis," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 7 (1937) 456-464; and Mather, J., "The Unconscious Significance of Fairyland," *Australian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy* 11 (1934) 16-32.
59. Codellas, P., "Modern Greek Folklore: The Smerdaki," *Journal of American Folklore* 58 (1945) 236-244; La Barre, W., "Kiowa Folk Sciences," *ibid.* 60 (1947) 105-114; Zeid, A. Abou, "La Psychoanalyse des Mythes," *Egyptian Journal of Psychology* 2 (1946); El-Sayyad, M. M., "The Psychology of the Egyptian People from Folksongs," *ibid.* 1 (1945) 151-171; Opler, M. E., "Japanese Folk Belief Concerning the Snake," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1 (1945) 249-259; Fortune, R. F., "The Symbolism of the Serpent," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 7 (1926) 237-243; Engle, B. S., "Attis, A Study in Castration," *Psychoanalytic Review* 23 (1936) 363-372, "Lemnos, Island of Women," *ibid.* 32 (1945) 353-358, "Melampus and Freud," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 11 (1942) 83-86, and "The Amazons in Ancient Greece," *ibid.* 512-554.
60. Bonaparte, Marie, "The Myth of the Corpse in the Car," *American Imago* 2 (1941) 105-126; "The Legend of the Unfathomable Waters," *ibid.* 4 (1946) 20-31; "Saint Christopher, Patron Saint of the Motor-Car Drivers," *ibid.* 5 (1947) 49-77.
61. Moellenhoff, F., "Remarks on the Popularity of Micky Mouse," *American Imago* 1 (1940) 19-32; Grotjahn, M., "Ferdinand the Bull," *ibid.* 33-41; Vowinkel-Weigert, E., "The Cult and Mythology of the Magna Mater," *Psychiatry* 1 (1938) 347-378; Kohen, M., "The Venus of Willendorf," *American Imago* 3 (1946) 49-60; Ferenczi, S., "On the Symbolism of the Head of the Medusa," in *Further Contributions* (London, 1926) 360; Coriat, I. "A Note on the Medusa Symbolism," *American Imago* 2 (1941) 281-285.
62. Karlson, K. J., "Psychoanalysis and Mythology," *Journal of Religious Psychology* 7 (1914) 137-213; Marett, R. R., *Psychology and Folklore*, London, 1920.

63. Kluckhohn, C., "Myths and Rituals, A General Theory," *Harvard Theological Review* 35 (1942) 45-79; Goldfrank, E. S., "The Impact of Situation and Personality on Four Hopi Emergence Myths," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 4 (1948) 241-262; Jacobs, M., "Psychological Inferences from a Chinook Myth," Paper read at the 1951 Meeting of the American Anthropological Association; Opler, M. K. & Obayashi, F., "Senryu Poetry as Folk and Community Expression," *Journal of American Folklore* 58 (1945) 1-11; La Barre, W., "The Psychopathology of Drinking Songs," *Psychiatry* 2 (1939) 203-212; *idem*, "Obscenity: An Anthropological Appraisal," *Law and Contemporary Problems* 20 (1955) 533-543; *idem*, "The Apperception of Attitudes," *American Imago* 6 (1949) 3-43; Honigsmann, J. J., "A Cultural Theory of Obscenity," *Journal of Criminal Psychopathology* 5 (1944) 715-733; Charles, L. H., "The Clown's Function," *Journal of American Folklore* 28 (1945) 23-34; Dollard, J., "The Dozens: Dialectic of Insult," *American Imago* 1 (1939) 3-25; Sterba, R., "A Dutch Celebration of a Festival," *American Imago* 2 (1941) 205-208; see also Sterba's articles cited in footnote 57.
64. La Barre, W., *The Human Animal*, pp. xii-xiii.
65. Freud, S., *Civilization and Its Discontents*, London, 1930. This trend in Freud's thinking has been illuminatingly continued in a book by H. Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization*, Boston, 1955, which Kluckhohn has well praised in a review, *New York Times Book Review Section*.
66. Freud, S., "A Neurosis of Demoniactal Possession in the Seventeenth Century," *Collected Papers IV*, London, 1925, pp. 436-472.
67. Alphandery, P., "De quelques documents médiévaux relatifs à des états psychasthéniques," *Journal de Psychologie Normale et Pathologique* 26 (1929) 763-787; Jeliffe, S. E., "Some Random Notes on the History of Psychiatry in the Middle Ages," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 10 (1930) 275-286; Kisker, G. W., "A Study of Mental Disorder in Ancient Greek Culture," *Psychiatry* 4 (1941) 535-545; Moreau, J. J., *La Psychologie Morbide dans ses Rapports avec la Philosophie de l'Histoire*, Paris, 1859; Osterreich, T. K., *Possession, Primitive, Middle Ages, and Modern*, New York, 1930; and Whitwell, J. R., *Historical Notes on Psychiatry*, Philadelphia 1937. J. C. Flugel, in *Man, Morals and Society*, London, 1945; Eric Fromm in various books; and Rattray Taylor, *Sex in History*, New York, 1956, have continued this trend.
68. Sapir, E., "Cultural Anthropology and Psychiatry," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 27 (1932) 229-242, "The Contribution of Psychiatry to an Understanding of Behavior in Society," *American Journal of Sociology* 42 (1937) 862-870, "The Emergence of the Concept of Personality in a Study of Culture,"

Journal of Social Psychology 5 (1933) 408-415, "The Unconscious Patterning of Behavior in Society," in Dummer, E. (ed.), *The Unconscious: A Symposium*, New York, 1929, pp. 114-142, and "Why Cultural Anthropology Needs the Psychiatrist," *Psychiatry* 1 (1938) 7-12. These papers represent the core of Sapir's contribution to culture-and-personality studies; they are most accessibly reprinted in Sapir, E., *Selected Writings in Language, Culture and Personality*, edited by D. G. Mandelbaum, Berkeley, 1949. His *Festschrift*, (Spier, L., Hallowell, A. I. & Newman, S. S. [eds.], *Language, Culture, and Personality; Essays in Memory of Edward Sapir*, Menasha [Wisconsin] 1941) contains a number of valuable contributions to culture and personality studies elsewhere cited.

69. Barnouw, V., "The Phantasy World of a Chippewa Woman," *Psychiatry* 12 (1949) 67-76; Coriat, I. H., "Psychoneuroses among Primitive Tribes," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 10 (1915) 201; Dubois, C., *The People of Alor*, Minneapolis, 1944; Hallowell, A. I., "Shabwan, a Dissocial Indian Girl," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 8 (1938) 329-340; La Barre, W., "A Cultist Drug Addiction in an Indian Alcoholic," *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic* 50 (1941) 40-46; Leighton, A. H. and D. G., *op. cit.*, footnote 14; Mead, Margaret, *Sex and Temperament*, New York, 1935; Molina, M. F., "Study of a Psychopathic Personality in Guatemala," *Psychiatry* 10 (1947) 31-36; Seligman, C. G., "Temperament, Conflict, and Psychosis in a Stone Age Population," *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 9 (1929) 187-202; and Spiro, M. E., "A Psychotic Personality in the South Seas," *Psychiatry* 13 (1951) 189-204. Róheim, of course, has made many such observations in his field work.
70. Devereux, George, *Reality and Dream, Psychotherapy of a Plains Indian*, New York 1951.
71. Beaglehole, E., "Culture and Psychosis in New Zealand," *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 48 (1939) 144-155, "Culture and Psychosis in Hawaii," in *Some Modern Hawaiians* (University of Hawaii Research Publications No. 19, Honolulu, 1939); Eaton, J. W., Weil, R. J., and Kaplan, B., "The Hutterite Mental Health Survey," *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1951, 3-21; Gillin, J., "Magical Fright," *Psychiatry* 11 (1948) 387-400; Green, Arnold W., "Culture, Normality, and Personality Conflict," *American Anthropologist* 50 (1948) 225-237; Hallowell, A. I., "Fear and Anxiety as Cultural and Individual Variables in a Primitive Society," *Journal of Social Psychology* 9 (1938) 25-47; Halpern, L., "Some Data on the Morbidity of Jews and Arabs in Palestine," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 94 (1938) 1215-1222; Landes, R., "The Abnormal among the Ojibwa In-

- dians," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 33 (1938), 14-33; Leighton, A. H. & D., "Some Types of Uneasiness and Fear in a Navaho Indian Community," *American Anthropologist* 44 (1942) 194-209; Lind, J. E., "Phylogentic Elements in the Psychoses of the Negro," *Psychoanalytic Review* 4 (1917) 303-332; Malzberg, B., "Mental Disease among Negroes in New York State," *Human Biology* 7 (1935) 471-513, "Migration and Mental Disease among Negroes in New York State," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 21 (1936) 107-113; Morgan, W., "Human Wolves among the Navaho," *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* 11, 1936; Nichols, L. A., "Neuroses in Native African Troops," *Journal of Mental Science* 90 (1944) 862-868; Randle, M. C., "Psychological Types from Iroquois Folktales," *Journal of American Folklore* 65 (1952) 13-21; Rusillon, H., *Un culte dynastique avec évocation des morts chez Sakalaves de Madagascar, le "Tromba"*, Paris, 1912; Saindon, E., "Mental Disorders among the James Bay Cree," *Primitive Man* 6 (1933) 1-12; Sandesehejew, G., "Weltanschauung und Schamanismus der Alaren-Burjaten," *Anthropos* 23 (1929) 976ff; Seligman, C. G., "Temperament, Conflict and Psychosis in a Stone Age Population," *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 9 (1929) 187-202; Shelley, D. M., & Watson, W. H., "An Investigation concerning Mental Disorder in the Nyassaland Natives," *Journal of Mental Science* 82 (1936) 701-730; Shirokogoroff, S. M., *Psychomental Complex of the Tungus*, London, 1935, "Social Organization of the Manehus," *Royal Asiatic Society (North China Branch)*, Extra Volume III, Shanghai, 1924; and Stevens, R. B., "Racial Aspects of Emotional Problems of Negro Students," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 103 (1947) 493-498.
72. Basedow, H., *The Australian Aborigine*, Adelaide, 1925, p. 229; Bogoras, W., *The Chukchee*, New York, 1909, 450ff; Crawford, J., *History of the Indian Archipelago*, Edinburgh, 1820, I: 66-70; Dobrizhoffer, M., *An Account of the Abipones*, London, 1822, ch. 22, 2:233-237; Driberg, J. H., *The Lango*, London, 1923; Grubb, W. B., *An Unknown People in an Unknown Land*, London, 1913, p. 205; Hrdlicka, A., "Physiological and Medical Observations among the Indians of the Southwest," *Bulletin, Bureau of American Ethnology* 34 (1908) 171-214, "Indians of Sonora, Mexico," *American Anthropologist* 6 (1904) 51-89, p. 83; Hyades, P., & Deniker, J., *Mission Scientifique de Cap Horn*, Paris, 1891, VII: 227-230; Peschuel-Loesche, E., *Völkerkunde von Loango*, Berlin, 1907, pp. 21-25; Reinach, S., "Le Laos Français," *Revue Indo-Chinoise* 1900, 82ff, pp. 150-152; Rivers, W. H. R., *The History of Melanesian Society*, 3 vols., London, 1914 (1:345); Roscoe, J., *The Baganda of East Africa*, London, 1911, 22ff,

- The Bakitara or Banyoro*, London, 1923, 290ff, *The Banyankole*, London, 1923, p. 117; Roth, H. L., *Natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo*, 2 vol., London, 1896, 1:95-96, 296; Safford, H., *In Court and Kampong*, London, 1897, pp. 78-80; Schweinfurth, G., *The Heart of Africa*, 3 vols., New York, 1874, 2:310; Skeat, W. W. & Blagdon, C. O., *Pagan Races of the Malay Archipelago*, 2 vols., 1906, 2:246-247; Solomon, V., "Extracts from Diaries kept in Car Nicobar," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 32 (1902) 202-238; Smith, E. W., & Dale, A. M., *The Ila Speaking Peoples of Northern Rhodesia*, 2 vols., London, 1920, 1:239; Steggerda, M. "Maya Indians of Yucatan," *Carnegie Institute Publications* 531, 1941; Talbot, P. A., *The Peoples of Southern Nigeria*, 3 vols., London, 1926, *passim*; and Weyer, E. M., *The Eskimos*, New Haven, 1932, pp. 118-119.
73. Benedict, R. "Anthropology and the Abnormal," *Journal of General Psychology* 10 (1934) 59-82, quotations from pp. 64, 73, 72; *idem*, "Anthropology and the Abnormal," *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 128 (1940) 2.
 74. Such, for example, has been the common criticism levelled against Bricker, R. M., *Is Germany Incurable?*, Philadelphia, 1943; and Bricker, R. M. & Lyons, L. V., "A Neuropsychiatric View of German Culture," *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases* 98 (1943) 281-293. The present writer has tried to make clear the predicament of Benedict's relativism, in La Barre, W., *The Human Animal*, pp. 233-266.
 75. Devereux, G., "A Sociological Theory of Schizophrenia," *Psychoanalytic Review* 26 (1939) 315-342; "Maladjustment and Social Neurosis," *American Sociological Review*, 4 (1939) 844-851; and in a forth-coming book.
 76. Cooper, J. M., "Mental Disease Situations in Certain Cultures: A New Field for Research," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 29 (1934) 10-17; also abstracted in *Publications of the American Sociological Society* 28 (1934) 129; "A Note on Adjustment and Culture," *Primitive Man* 12 (1939) 57-59. The terms above are of course those of Ferenczi.
 77. Coriat, I. M., "Psychoneuroses among Primitive Tribes," *Studies in Abnormal Psychology*, series 6 (1915) 201-208.
 78. De La Tourette, G., *Traité clinique et thérapeutique de l'hystérie*, 3 vols., Paris 1891-1895, 1:1-19 *et passim*. Others were Hilfficker, K., "Critique of Freud's Views on Ideation of Schizophrenic Patients and Primitive Peoples," *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie* 89 (1928) 97-108; Hirsch, A., *Handbook of Geographical and Historical Pathology*, 3 vols., London, 1883-1886, 3:516-529; and Hovorka, O., & Kronfeld, A., *Vergleichende Volksmedizin*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1909, 2:179ff and 241ff.; indeed, the great taxon-

- omist in psychiatry, Kraepelin, was already aware of the problem of differential incidence of mental disorders in various groups (Kraepelin, E., "Vergleichende Psychiatrie," *Centralblatt für Nervenheilkunde und Psychiatrie* 27 [1904] 433-438, and in *General Paresis*, New York, 1913, p. 140). See also his *Manic-Depressive Insanity*, Edinburgh, 1921, pp. 170-1.
79. Frank, L. K., "Physiological Tensions and Social Structure," *Papers and Proceedings, 88th Annual Meeting, American Sociological Society* (1928) 74-82; *Society as the Patient*, New Brunswick, 1948; and "Cultural Control and Physiological Autonomy," in Kluckhohn, C., & Murray, H. A. (ed.), *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture*, New York, 1948, 113-116. Fromm, E., "Individual and Social Origins of Neurosis," in Kluckhohn and Murray, pp. 407-413; "On the Problem of German Characterology," *Transactions of the New York Academy of Science* II, 5 (1942-1943) 79-83. Horney, K., *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*, New York, 1937; *New Ways in Psychoanalysis*, New York, 1939.
 80. Green, A. W., "Social Values and Psychotherapy," *Journal of Personality* 14 (1946) 199-228; Hallowell, A. I., "Culture and Mental Disorder," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 29 (1934) 1-9; Henry, J., "The Inner Experience of Culture," *Psychiatry* 14 (1951) 87-104; Honigsmann, J. J., "Culture Patterns and Human Stress," *Psychiatry* 13 (1950) 25-34; Hsu, F. L. K., "Sex Crime and Personality, a Study in Comparative Cultural Patterns," *American Scholar*, Dec. 1951, pp. 57-66; Kroeber, A. L., "Cultural Anthropology," in Bentley, M. (ed.), *The Problem of Mental Disorder*, New York, 1934, and "Psychosis or Social Sanction," *Character and Personality* 8 (1940) 204-215; La Barre, W., "The Age Period of Cultural Fixation," *Mental Hygiene* 33 (1949) 209-221 (reprinted as "Wanted: A Pattern for Modern Man" in the pamphlet series of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene), "Social Cynosure and Social Structure," *Journal of Personality* 14 (1946) 169-183, "Toward World Citizenship," *Survey Graphic* 85 (1949) 153-156, 187-189 (reprinted, *Foreign Service Institute*, Dept. of State, Washington, D. C., as a training document), and "Child Care and World Peace," *The Child* 13 (1949) 156-157 (also reprinted FSI training document); Linton, R., "The Effects of Culture on Mental and Emotional Processes," *Research Publications, Association Nervous and Mental Diseases* 19 (1939) 293-304; Warner, W. L., "The Society, the Individual and His Mental Disorders," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 94 (1937) 275-284; and Westermarck, E., *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, 2 vols., London, 1906, 2: 269-272.
 81. Kirby, G. H., "A Study of Race Psychopathology," *New York*

- State Hospital Bulletin* March 1909; Róheim, G., "Racial Differences in the Neurosis and Psychosis," *Psychiatry* 2 (1939) 375-390; Schilder, P., "Cultural Patterns and Constructive Psychology," *Psychoanalytic Review* 27 (1940) 159-177, and "The Sociological Implications of Neuroses," *Journal of Social Psychology* 15 (1942) 3-21; Skliar, N., & Starikowa, K., "Zur vergleichende Psychiatrie," *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenheilkunde* 88 (1929) 554-585; Von Domarus, E., "Anthropology and Psychotherapy," *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 2 (1948) 603-614.
82. Klineberg, O., *Race Differences*, New York, 1935, ch. 18, especially pp. 294-299; Smith, M. H., "A Comparison of the Neurotic tendencies of Students of Different Racial Ancestry in Hawaii," *Journal of Social Psychology* 9 (1938) 395-417; Unwin, J. D., *Sexual Regulations and Cultural Behaviour*, London, 1935.
 83. Bunzel, R., "The Role of Alcoholism in Two Central American Cultures," *Psychiatry* 3 (1940) 361-387; and Horton, D., "The Functions of Alcohol in Primitive Societies," in Kluckhohn & Murray, *op. cit.*, pp. 540-550.
 84. Adelman, F., "Toward a Psycho-Cultural Interpretation of Latah," *Davidson Journal of Anthropology*, Spring 1955; Clifford, H., *Studies in Brown Humanity*, London, 1898, pp. 189-195; *idem*, *In Court and Kampong*, London, 1897, pp. 78-80; Codet, H., "Psychonevroses exotiques, l'amok et le Lâtah de Malaisie," *Le Progrès Médical* 42 (1927) 241-242; Crawford, J., *History of the Indian Archipelago*, Edinburgh, 1820, 1:66-70; Ellis, W. G., "The amok of the Malays," *Journal of Mental Science* 39 (1893) 325-338; Fletcher, W., "Latah and Amok," *British Encyclopedia of Medical Practice*, London, 1938, pp. 641-650; Galloway D. J. & O'Brien, "Amok," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 85 (1922); Metzger, E., "Einiges über Amok und Mataglap," *Globus* 52 (1897) 107-110; Rasch, C., "Ueber Amok," *Neurologisches Centralblatt* 13 (1894) 550-554, and "Ueber die Amok-Krankheit der Malayen," *ibid.* 14 (1895) 856-859; Tarde, G., "Les maladies de l'imitation," *Revue Scientifique* 45 (1890) 737-748, 46:6-11; and Van Brero, P. C. Z., "Latah," *Journal of Mental Science* (1895) 537; Van Loon, F. H. G., "Amok and Latah," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 21 (1926) 434-444, and "Protopathic-instinctive Phenomena in Normal and Pathological Malay Life," *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 8 (1928) 264-276.
 85. Aberle, D., "Arctic Hysteria and Latah in Mongolia," *Transactions of the New York Academy of Science*, Series II, vol. 14, no. 7 (1952) 291-297; Armangue y Tuest, J., "Mimicismo o neurosis imitante," *Revista de Ciencias Medicas de Barcelona* 10 (1884) 574, 583, 613, 680, 715, 746-777; Bogoras, W., *The Chukchee*,

- New York, 1909, 450ff.; Brill, A., "Piblokto or Hysteria among Peary's Eskimo," *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases* 40 (1913) 514-520; Czaplicka, M. A., *Aboriginal Siberia*, London, 1914, pp. 305-325; Novakovsky, S., "Arctic or Siberian Hysteria as a Reflex of the Geographical Environment," *Ecology* 5 (1924) 113-127; and Steensby, H. P., "Contributions to the Ethnology of the Polar Eskimo," *Meddelelser om Grønland* 34 (1910) 377-378.
86. Angelino, H. & Shedd, C. L., "A Note on Berdache," *American Anthropologist* 57 (1955) 121-126; Devereux, G., "Institutionalized Homosexuality of the Mohave Indians," *Human Biology* 9 (1937) 498-527; Gifford, E. W., *The Cocopa*, *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 31 (1933) 294; Hill, W. W., "Notes on the Pima Berdache," *American Anthropologist* 40 (1938) 338-340, and "Status of the hermaphrodite and transvestite in Navaho culture," *American Anthropologist* 37 (1935) 273-279; Karsch-Haack, *Die gleichgeschlechtliche Leben der Naturvölker*, 1911; Kroeber, A. L. (ed.), "Handbook of the Indians of California," *Bulletin of the Bureau of American Ethnology* 78 (1925) pp. 46, 190, 497, 500, 647, 748, and 803; Parsons, E. C., "The Study of Variants," *Journal of American Folklore* 33 (1920) 87-90, and "The Zuni la'mana," *American Anthropologist* 18 (1916) 521-528; Seligman, C. G., "Sexual Inversion among Primitive Races," *Alienist and Neurologist* 23 (1902); Spier, L., *Klamath Ethnography*, *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 30 (1930) 51-53, and *Yuman Tribes of the Gila River*, Chicago, 1933, pp. 242-243; Voegelin, C., *Tübatulabal Ethnography*, *Anthropological Records*, *University of California* 2 (1938) 78-80; and Westermarck, E., *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, 2 vols., London, 1906, 2:456-478.
 87. Dr. Alfred G. Smith, of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Emory University, Georgia, has a well-nigh exhaustive bibliography on latah, as well as amok, but has not yet published on the subject.
 88. Musgrave, W. E., & Sison, A. G., "Mali-mali, a Mimic Psychosis in the Philippine Islands," *Philippine Journal of Science* VI (1910).
 89. Hammond, W. A., "Myriachit," *New York Medical Journal* 39 (1884) 191; "Myriachit," *Aeschlapien* 1 (1884) 57-60; and "Myriachit," *British Medical Journal* 1 (1884) 758.
 90. Amir, M., "Criminal Schizophrenics among Bataks," *Geneesk Tijdschrift van Nederlandsch Indie* 75 (1935) 24-33; Demerath, N. J., "Schizophrenia among Primitives," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 98 (1942) 703-707; Faris, R. E. L., "Some Observations on the Incidence of Schizophrenia in Primitive Society,"

- Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 29 (1934) 30-31; Lopes, C., "Ethnographische Betrachtungen über Schizophrenia," *Zeitschrift für die gesammelte Neurologie und Psychiatrie* 142 (1932) 706-711; Plattner, W., "Race Mixtures and Relation between Racial and Constitutional Types in Schizophrenia," *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie* 9 (1933) 410-431; and Travaglino, P. H. M., "Schizophrenia and the Javanese Psyche," *Psychiatrische und Neurologische Blätter* 31 (1927) 416-425.
91. Lasch, R., "Der Selbstmord aus erotischen Motiven bei den primitiven Völkern," *Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaft* 2 (1899) 578-585; Steinmetz, S. R., "Suicide among Primitive Peoples," *American Anthropologist* [old series] 7 (1894) 65-60; Weichbrodt, R., *Der Selbstmord*, Basel, 1937; Westermarck, E., *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, 2 vols., London, 1906, 2:229-240; and Wisse, J., *Selbstmord und Todesfurcht bei den Naturvölkern*, Zutphen, 1933.
 92. Gloyne, H. F., "Tarantism, Mass Hysterical Reaction to Spider Bite in the Middle Ages," *American Imago* 7 (1950) 29-42.
 93. Dhunjibhoy, J. E., "A Brief Résumé of the Types of Insanity commonly met with in India, with a full description of 'Indian Hemp Insanity' peculiar to the Country," *Journal of Mental Science* 76 (1930) 254-264; La Barre, W., *The Peyote Cult*, Yale University Publications in Anthropology 19, 1938.
 94. Cooper, J. M., "The Cree *wihtiko* Psychosis," *Primitive Man* 6 (1933) 20-24; Guinard, J. E., "Witiko among the Tete de Boule," *Primitive Man* 3 (1934) 69-71.
 95. Ackerknecht, E. H., "Psychopathology, Primitive Medicine and Primitive Culture," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 14 (1943) 30-67; Beaglehole, E., "A Note on Cultural Compensation," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 33 (1938) 121-123; *idem*, "Emotional Release in a Polynesian Community," *ibidem* 32 (1937) 319-328; Darlington, H. S., "An Instance of Primitive Psychotherapy," *Psychological Review* 25 (1938) 205-208; *idem*, "Confession of Sins," *Psychoanalytic Review* 24 (1937) 150-164; Devereux, G., "Primitive Psychiatry," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 8 (1940) 1194-1213 & 11 (1942) 522-542; *idem*, *Reality and Dream*, New York, 1951; *idem*, "The Mental Hygiene of the American Indian," *Mental Hygiene* 26 (1942) 74-81; Gillin, J., "Magical Fright," *Psychiatry* 11 (1948) 387-400; Hallowell, A. I., "Sin, Sex and Sickness in Saulteaux Beliefs," *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 18 (1939) 191-197; Hill, W. W., "Navaho Rites for dispelling Insanity and Delirium," *El Palacio* 41 (1936) 71-75; Jenness, D., "An Indian Method of treating Hysteria," *Primitive Man* 6 (1933) 13-20; La Barre, W., "Primitive Psychotherapy in native American Cultures: Peyotism and

- Confession," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 42 (1947) 294-309; Leighton, A. & D., "Elements of Psychotherapy in Navaho Religion," *Psychiatry* 4 (1941) 515-523; Morgan, W., "Navaho Treatment of Sickness," *American Anthropologist* 33 (1931) 390 et seq.; Opler, M. E., "Some Points of Comparison and Contrast between the Treatment of Functional Disorders by the Apache Shamans and Modern Psychiatric Practice," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 92 (1936) 1371-1387; Pfister, O., "Instinctive Psychoanalysis among the Navahos," *Journal of Mental and Nervous Disorders* 76 (1932) 234-255; Rogers, S. L., "Early Psychotherapy," *Ciba Symposia* 9 (1947) 602-632; Stewart, K., "Dream Theory in Malaya," *Complex* 6 (1951) 21-33; Stirling, M. W., "Jivaro Shamanism," *Psychoanalytic Review* 20 (1933) 412-420; Rirz, R., *Exorcismus und Heilkunde auf Ceylon*, Berne, 1941; and Wyman, H. C., "Navaho Diagnosticians," *American Anthropologist* 38 (1936) 236-246.
96. Kohen, *op. cit.*, footnote 61; Heilbronner, P., "Some Remarks on the Treatment of the Sexes in Palaeolithic Art," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 19 (1938) 441; Flügel, J. C., and Taylor, G. R., in works cited footnote 67; Wallace, A. F. C., "A Possible Technique for Recognizing Psychological Characteristics of the Ancient Maya from an Analysis of their Art," *American Imago* 7 (1951) 3-22; Webster, D., "The Origin of the Signs of the Zodiac," *American Imago* 1 (1940) 31-47; Bernfeld, S. C., "Freud and Archaeology," *American Imago* 8 (1951) 107-128; Boyer, L. B., "Sculpture and Depression," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 106 (1950) 606-615.
97. Anyone who thinks of writing seriously on the relations of races should know at least Bettelheim, B., "The Psychoanalysis of Anti-Semitism," *Complex* Fall 1930, pp. 35-41; Fenichel, O., "Psychoanalysis of Antisemitism," *American Imago* 1 (1940) 24-39; Leoblowitz-Leonard, H., "A Psychoanalytic Contribution to the Problem of Antisemitism," *Psychoanalytic Review* 32 (1945) 359-361; Lowenstein, R. M., "The Historical and Cultural Roots of Anti-Semitism," in Róheim, S. (ed.) *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*, New York, 1947; Lurié, A., "The Jew as a Psychological Type," *American Imago* 6 (1949) 119-155; Sterba, R., "Some Psychological Factors in Negro Race Hatred and Anti-Negro Riots," in Róheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 411-427.
98. Sapir, E., *op. cit.*, footnote 12; Garvin, P. L., "Standard Average European and Czech," *Studia Linguistica* 3 (1949) 65-85; Tregar, G. L., manuscripts and projected work; Newman, S., "Analysis of Spoken Language of Patients with Affective Disorders," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 94 (1938) 913-94; "Personal Symbolism in Language Patterns," *Psychiatry* 2 (1939) 177-184;

- "Behavior Patterns in Linguistic Structure: A Case Study," in Sapir Festschrift, pp. 94-106. On communication see: Henry, J., "The Linguistic Expression of Emotion," *American Anthropologist* 38 (1936) 250-256; Goldfrank, E. S., *op. cit.*, footnote 20; Thorner, I., "German Words, German Personality, and Protestantism," *Psychiatry* 8 (1945) 403-417; Birdwhistel, R., mss. and projected work; Klineberg, O., "Emotional Expression in Chinese Literature," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 33 (1938) 517-520; La Barre, W., "The Cultural Basis of Emotions and Gestures," *Journal of Personality* 16 (1947) 49-68, reprinted in Haring, D. G. (ed.), *op. cit.*, footnote 28.
99. Darlington, H. S., "The Primitive Manufacture of Clay Pots: An Exposition of the Psychology of Pot-Making," *Psychoanalytic Review* 24 (1937) 392-402; Weisskopf, W. A., *The Psychology of Economics*, Chicago, 1935; Tausk, V., "On the Origin of the Influencing Machine in Schizophrenia," *Psychiatric Quarterly* 2 (1933) 519-556; Schilder, P., *The Image and Appearance of the Human Body*, London, 1935; Lorand, S., "A Note on the Psychology of the Inventor," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 3 (1934) 30-41; Sachs, Hanns, "The Delay of the Machine Age," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 2 (1933) 404-424; Yu-lan Fung, "Why China has no Science," *International Journal of Ethics* 32 (1922) 258-259.
100. Harrison, J. E., *Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, Cambridge University Press, 1921; Cornford, F. M., "The Unconscious Element in Literature and Philosophy," *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, 1922; Engle, B. S., *opera cit.*, footnote 59; Freud, S., *Moses and Monotheism*, London, 1940; *The Future of an Illusion*, London, 1928; "Obsessive Acts and Religious Practices," *Collected Papers* 2:25-35; Jones, E., *op. cit.*, footnote 56, also "Psychoanalysis and the Psychology of Religion," in S. Lorand (ed.), *Psychoanalysis Today*, New York, 1933; Kardiner, A., *opera cit.*, footnote 31; Reik, T., *Ritual: Psychoanalytic Studies*, New York, 1940, and *Dogma and Compulsion*, New York, 1951; Weigert, E., *op. cit.* footnote 61.
101. Freud, S., "Psychoanalysis and the Ascertaining of Truth in Courts of Law," *Collected Papers* 2:13-24; Alexander, F. & Healy, W., *Roots of Crime*, New York, 1935; Fries, M., "National and International Difficulties," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 11 (1941) 562-573; Stanton, A. H. & Perry, S. E. (eds.), *Personality and Political Crisis*, Glencoe, 1954; Honigsmann, J. J., "Morale in a Primitive Society," *Character and Personality* 12 (1944) 228-236; Yap, P. M., "The Mental Illness of Hung Hsiu-Ch'uan, Leader of the Taping Rebellion," *Far Eastern Quarterly*, May 1954, pp. 287-304; Lasswell, H. D., *Psychopathology and*

- Politics*, Chicago, 1930; West, R., *Conscience and Society, A Study of the Psychological Prerequisites of Law and Order*, London, 1942; De Grazia, S., "A Note on the Psychological Position of the Chief Executive," *Psychiatry* 8 (1945) 267-272.
102. Brill, A. A., "The Psychopathology of Selections of Vocations," *Medical Record* (New York) 23 February 1918; Davidson, S. M., "Anxiety States Arising in Naval Personnel Afloat and Ashore," *New York State Journal of Medicine* 42 (1942) 1654-1656; Dollard, J. & Harten, D., *Fear in Battle*, New Haven, 1943; Frank, L. K., "Psychosomatic Disturbances in Relation to Personnel Selection," *Annals of the New York Academy of Science* 44 (1943) 439-622; Hadley, E. E., "Unrecognized Antagonisms Complicating Business Enterprise," *Psychiatry* 1 (1938) 13-31; Kris, E. & Leites, N., "Trends in Twentieth Century Propaganda," in Róheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 393-410; Maskin, M. H. & Altman, L. L., "Military Psychodynamics: Psychological Factors in the Transition from Civilian to Soldier," *Psychiatry* 6 (1943) 263-269; Rinaldo, J., *The Psychoanalysis of the Reformer*, New York, 1921; Stephenson, G. U. & Cameron K., "Anxiety States in the Navy," *British Medical Journal* 2 (1943) 603-607; La Barre, W., *The Human Animal*, pp. 98-109.